arXiv:1201.1401v1 [math.DS] 6 Jan 2012

RIGIDITY FOR PIECEWISE SMOOTH HOMEOMORPHISMS ON THE CIRCLE

KLEYBER CUNHA AND DANIEL SMANIA

ABSTRACT. We find conditions for two piecewise $C^{2+\nu}$ homeomorphisms f and g of the circle to be C^1 conjugate. Besides the restrictions on the combinatorics of the maps (we assume that the maps have bounded combinatorics), and necessary conditions on the one-side derivatives of points where f and g are not differentiable, we also assume zero mean nonlinearity for f and g.

1. INTRODUCTION AND RESULTS

Consider the following rigidity problem. Let $f, g : X \to X$ be two (piecewise) smooth dynamical systems that are conjugated by an orientation preserving homeomorphism, i.e., there is $h : X \to X$ such that $f \circ h = h \circ g$. On what conditions is the conjugation smooth (for instance C^1)? When $X = \mathbb{S}^1$ and f, g are smooth diffeomorphisms there are many results of rigidity, for example, [Her79], [Yoc10], [SK89], [KO89]. In this article we study the rigidity problem for piecewise smooth homemorphisms on the circle.

The map $f : \mathbb{S}^1 \to \mathbb{S}^1$ is a piecewise smooth homemomorphism on the circle if f is a homeomorphism, has jumps in the first derivative on finitely many points, that we call break points, and f is smooth outside its break points. The set $BP_f = \{x \in \mathbb{S}^1 : \ BP_f(x) := Df(x_-)/Df(x_+) \neq 1\}$ is called the set of break points of f and the number $BP_f(x)$ is called the break of f at x. Denote $BP_f = \{x_1, ..., x_m\}$ and $BP_g = \{y_1, ..., y_n\}$.

Date: January 9, 2012.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37E10, 37E05, 37E20, 37C05, 37B10.

Key words and phrases. renormalization, interval exchange transformations, Rauzy-Veech induction, universality, homeomorphism on the circle, convergence.

This work is based on the Ph. D. Thesis of the first author [Cun10]. K. C was partially supported by FAPESP 07/01045-7. D.S. was partially supported by FAPESP 2008/02841-4 and 2010/08654-1, CNPq 310964/2006-7 and 303669/2009-8.

We say that two piecewise smooth homeomorphisms on the circle are *break-equivalents* if there exists a topological conjugacy h such that $h(BP_f) = BP_g$ and $BP_f(x_i) = BP_g(h(x_i))$. It is easy to see that there is a C^1 conjugacy between f and g then f and g are *break-equivalents.*

As in [CS11] the key idea is to consider piecewise smooth homeomorphisms on the circle as generalized interval exchange transformations, g.i.e.t. for short. Let I be an interval and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a finite set (the *alphabet*) with $d \geq 2$ elements and $\mathcal{P} = \{I_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$ be an $\mathcal{A}-$*indexed* partition of I into subintervals[1]. We say that the triple $(f, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P})$, where $f : I \to I$ is a bijection, is a g.i.e.t. with d intervals, if $f|_{I_\alpha}$ is an orientation-preserving homeomorphism for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. The order of subinterval in the domain and in the image of f constitue the combinatorial data of f, denoted by $\pi = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$, where $\pi_i : \mathcal{A} \to \{1, ..., d\}$ is a bijection for $i = 1, 2$ and π_0, π_1 given the order of subintervals I_α and $f(I_\alpha)$ in I, respectively. For the explicit formula of $\pi = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$ see [CS11]. We always assume that the combinatorial data is irreducible, i.e., $\pi_1 \circ \pi_0^{-1}(\{1, ..., s\}) \neq \{1, ..., s\}$ for all $1 \leq s \leq d - 1$.

There is a renormalization scheme in the space of g.i.e.m. called the Rauzy-Veech induction ([Rau79], [Vee78]), that associates with f a sequence of first return maps $f_n = R^n(f)$ to a nested sequence of intervals I^n with the same left endpoint of I. The map f_n is again g.i.e.m. with the same alphabet $\mathcal{A}$ but the combinatorial data may be different.

More specifically, denoting by $\alpha(0), \alpha(1) \in \mathcal{A}$ the letters such that $\pi_0(\alpha(0)) = d$ and $\pi_1(\alpha(1)) = d$, we compare the lenght of the intervals $I_{\alpha(0)}$ and $f(I_{\alpha(1)})$. If $|I_{\alpha(0)}| > |f(I_{\alpha(1)})|$ (resp. $|I_{\alpha(0)}| > |f(I_{\alpha(1)})|$) we say that f has type 0 (resp. type 1) and that the letter $\alpha(0)$ is the winner (resp. loser) and that the letter $\alpha(1)$ is the loser (resp. winner). Then putting $I^1 = I \setminus f(I_{\alpha(1)})$ (resp. $I^1 = I \setminus I_{\alpha(0)}$), we have that $R(f)$ is the first return map of f to the interval I^1 and so on. We say that f has no connections if the orbits of the boundary of each I_α are distinct whenever possible. It has been established by [Kea75] that if an interval exchange transformation f has no connections then f is infinitely renormalizable. If a g.i.e.m. f is infinitely renormalizable then the sequence $(\pi^n, \varepsilon^n)_n$ of combinatorial data and types of $R^n(f)$ is called *combinatorics* of f. For more details about the Rauzy-Veech induction the reader may consult, for example, [CS11], [MMY10b], [Via08].

For each i.e.t. f it is possible to associate a genus g that correspond to the genus of translate surface associate to f [Zor96]. This genus is invariant under Rauzy-Veech renormalization. Indeed f has *genus one* if f has at most two discontinuities. In a similar way, we will say that a g.i.e.m. has genus one if f has at most two discontinuites. If f is a homeomorphism on the circle, then f has genus one as a g.i.e.m.

---

[1] All the subintervals will be bounded, closed on the left and open on the right.

Let H be a non-degenerate interval, let $g : H \to \mathbb{R}$ be a homeomorphism and let $J \subset H$ be an interval. We define the *Zoom* of g in H, denoted by $\mathcal{Z}_H(g)$, the transformation $\mathcal{Z}_H(g) = A_1 \circ g \circ A_2$, where A_1 and A_2 are orientation-preserving affine maps, which sends $[0,1]$ into H and $g(H)$ into $[0,1]$ respectively. So we can identify a g.i.e.m. f defined in the interval $[0,1]$ with the quadruple

$$\big(\pi, (|I_\alpha|)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}, (|f(I_\alpha)|)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}, (Z_{I_\alpha} f)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}\big) \in \Pi_d \times \Delta_{\mathcal{A}} \times \Delta_{\mathcal{A}} \times \mathrm{Hom}_+([0,1]),$$

where $\mathrm{Hom}_+([0,1])$ is the set of orientation preserving homeomorphisms $h : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ such that $h(0) = 0$ and $h(1) = 1$, $|J|$ denote the length of interval J and

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{A}} = \{(x_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{A}} \text{ s.t. } x_\alpha > 0 \text{ and } \sum_\alpha x_\alpha = 1\}.$$

If we change the set $\mathrm{Hom}_+([0,1])$ by the set $\mathrm{Diff}_+^r([0,1])$ of orientation preserving diffeomorphism h of class C^r such that $h(0) = 0$ and $h(1) = 1$ we get the space of g.i.e.m. of class C^r. If we change the set $\mathrm{Hom}_+([0,1])$ by the set $\{\mathrm{Id}\}$ we have the space of affine i.e.t.. If in addition we replace the set $\Delta_{\mathcal{A}} \times \Delta_{\mathcal{A}}$ by the set $\{(\lambda,\lambda), \lambda \in \Delta_{\mathcal{A}}\}$ we get the space of standard i.e.t..

In the set of g.i.e.t. of class C^r, $r \geq 0$, we define the distance in the C^r topology by

$$\begin{aligned} d_{C^r}(f,g) \;:=\; & \max_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \big\{ \|Z_{I_\alpha} f - Z_{\tilde{I}_\alpha} g\|_{C^r} \big\} + \\ & \Big\| (I_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} - (\tilde{I}_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \Big\|_1 + \Big\| (f(I_\alpha))_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} - (g(\tilde{I}_\alpha))_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \Big\|_1, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{C^r}$ denote the sup-norm in the C^r topology and $\|\cdot\|_1$ denote the sum-norm.

Let $\alpha^n(\varepsilon^n), \alpha^n(1-\varepsilon^n)$ be the winner and loser letters of $R^n(f)$, where $\varepsilon^n \in \{0,1\}$ is its type. As defined in [CS11] we say that infinitely renormalizable g.i.e.m. f has *$k-$bounded combinatorics* if for each n and $\beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists $n_1, p \geq 0$, with $|n - n_1| < k$ and $|n - n_1 - p| < k$, such that $\alpha^{n_1}(\varepsilon^{n_1}) = \beta$, $\alpha^{n_1+p}(1 - \varepsilon^{n_1+p}) = \gamma$ and

$$\alpha^{n_1+i}(1 - \varepsilon^{n_1+p}) = \alpha^{n_1+i+1}(\varepsilon^{n_1+i})$$

for every $0 \leq i < p$.

Let $\mathcal{B}_k^{2+\nu}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\nu > 0$, be the set of g.i.e.m. $f : I \to I$ such that

(i) For each $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ we can extend f to $\overline{I_\alpha}$ as an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism of class $C^{2+\nu}$;

(ii) the g.i.e.m. f has $k-$bounded combinatorics;

(iii) The map f has genus one and has no connections;

In [CS11] the authors show that if $f \in \mathcal{B}_k^{2+\nu}$ then $R^n(f)$ converges to a $3(d-1)-$dimensional space of the fractional linear g.i.e.t. Moreover if mean-nonlinearity is zero then $R^n(f)$ converge to a $2(d-1)-$dimensional space of the affine interval exchange maps. Our main results are:

Theorem 1. *Let* $(f, \mathcal{A}, \{I_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}) \in \mathcal{B}_k^{2+\nu}$ *be such that*

$$\int \frac{D^2f(x)}{Df(x)}dx = 0. \tag{2}$$

Then there exists an affine i.e.t. $(f_A, \mathcal{A}, \{\tilde{I}_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}})$, *i.e.,* $f_A|_{\tilde{I}_\alpha}$ *is affine for each* $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, *and* $0 < \lambda < 1$ *such that*

(i) f_A *has the same combinatorics of* f;
(ii) $d_{C^2}(R^n f, R^n f_A) = O(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}})$.

Theorem 2 (Universality)**.** *If* f *and* g *satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1 and they have the same combinatorics and they are break-equivalents then we can choose* $f_A = g_A$.

The next result is a consequence of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.

Theorem 3. *Let* $f, g \in \mathcal{B}_k^{2+\nu}$ *be such that*

i. f *and* g *have the same combinatorics;*
ii. f *and* g *are break-equivalents;*
iii. *We have*

$$\int_0^1 \frac{D^2f(s)}{Df(s)}ds = \int_0^1 \frac{D^2g(s)}{Dg(s)}ds = 0.$$

Then there exists $0 < \lambda < 1$ *such that*

$$d_{C^2}(R^n f, R^n g) = O(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}).$$

It is known that if f and g has the same $k-$bounded combinatorics then they are semi-conjugate and this semi-conjugation send break-point in break-point [MMY10b]. If f and g have genus one then this semi-conjugation is indeed a conjugation (non wandering intervals).

Theorem 4 (Rigidity)**.** *Suppose that* f *and* g *satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 3. Then* f *and* g *are* C^1*-conjugated.*

Remark 1.1. *We believe that Theorems 3 and 4 hold replacing the condition iii. by*

$$\int_0^1 \frac{D^2f(s)}{Df(s)}ds = \int_0^1 \frac{D^2g(s)}{Dg(s)}ds.$$

Theorem 5 (Linearization)**.** *If f satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1 then f is C^1-conjugate with a unique piecewise affine homeomorphism on the circle.*

There are previous results on rigidity for piecewise smooth diffeomorphism of the circle with only one break point and also satisfying certain combinatorial restrictions [KK03] [KT10]. There are also recent results [MMY10b] on the structure of the set of "simple", small deformations of a standard i.e.m. T_0 (with certain Roth type combinatorics) which are C^r conjugated with T_0, but the nature of their results and methods are quite distinct from ours.

2. Rauzy-Veech Cocycle

In this section we use the notation of [Via08].

Let π be a combinatorial data of a g.i.e.m. and let $\lambda = (\lambda_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}$ be a vector in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}$. Define $\omega = (\omega_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}$ as

$$\omega_\alpha = \sum_{\pi_1(\beta)<\pi_1(\alpha)} \lambda_\beta - \sum_{\pi_0(\beta)<\pi_0(\alpha)} \lambda_\beta. \tag{3}$$

Notice that $\Omega_\pi(\lambda) = \omega$, where Ω_π is the anti-symmetric matrix given by

$$\Omega_{\alpha,\beta} = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{se } \pi_1(\alpha) > \pi_1(\beta) \text{ and } \pi_0(\alpha) < \pi_0(\beta) \\ -1 & \text{se } \pi_1(\alpha) < \pi_1(\beta) \text{ and } \pi_0(\alpha) > \pi_0(\beta) \\ 0 & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If π has genus one then $\dim Ker\ \Omega_\pi = d-2$, so $\dim Im\ \Omega_\pi = 2$. Denote by Π^1 the set of all possible genus one irreducible combinatorial data $\pi = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$. The Rauzy-Veech cocycle are the functions

$$\Theta_\varepsilon \colon \Pi^1 \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}} \to \Pi^1 \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}},$$

with $\varepsilon \in \{0,1\}$, defined by $\Theta_\varepsilon(\pi, v) = (r_\varepsilon(\pi), \Theta_{\pi,\epsilon} v)$. Here

$$\Theta_{\pi,\varepsilon} = \mathbb{I} + E_{\alpha(1-\varepsilon)\alpha(\varepsilon)}, \tag{4}$$

where $E_{\alpha\beta}$ is the elementary matrix whose only nonzero coefficient is 1 in position (α, β) and $r_\varepsilon(\pi)$ is the combinatorial data of $R(f)$.

We know that if $\pi' = r_\varepsilon(\pi)$ then

$$\Theta_{\pi,\varepsilon}\Omega_\pi = \Omega_{\pi'}(\Theta^t_{\pi,\varepsilon})^{-1} \tag{5}$$

Let $g : [0,1) \to [0,1)$ be an affine i.e.m. without connexions. Then g is uniquely determined by the triple (π, λ, ω^0), where π is the combinatorial data, $\lambda = (\lambda_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$ is the partition vector of the domain and $\omega^0 = (\omega^0_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is such that

$$g(x) = e^{\omega^0_\alpha} x + \delta_\alpha \text{ for all } x \in I_\alpha.$$

For each n denote by $\omega^n = (\omega^n_\alpha)_\alpha$ the vector such that $R^n(g)(x) = e^{\omega^n_\alpha} x + \delta^n_\alpha$ for all $x \in I^n_\alpha$. By Rauzy-Veech algorithm we know that

$$\omega^{n+1}_\alpha = \omega^n_\alpha \text{ if } \alpha \neq \alpha^n(1-\varepsilon) \tag{6}$$

$$\omega^{n+1}_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)} = \omega^n_{\alpha^n(\varepsilon)} + \omega^n_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}, \text{ otherwise,} \tag{7}$$

where $\alpha^n(\varepsilon)$ and $\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)$ are the winner and loser of $R^n(g)$ respectively. Therefore

$$\Theta_n(\omega^n) = \Theta_{\pi^n,\varepsilon^n}(\omega^n) = \omega^{n+1}.$$

Repeating this process inductively we have

$$\Theta_n \Theta_{n-1} \cdots \Theta_1 \Theta_0(\omega^0) = \omega^n.$$

To prove Theorem 1 we need to understand the hyperbolic properties of the Rauzy-Veech cocycle restricted to the k-bounded combinatorics.

2.1. **Invariant cones.** Since $\Theta_{\pi,\varepsilon}$, $\Theta^t_{\pi,\varepsilon}$ are non negative matrices, it preserves the positive cone $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}_+$. It follows from (5) that

$$\Theta_{\pi,\varepsilon} \text{Im } \Omega_\pi = \text{Im } \Omega_{\pi'}.$$

We need to find cones inside Im Ω_π which are invariant by the action of $\Theta_{\pi,\varepsilon}$ and $\Theta^{-1}_{\pi,\varepsilon}$. Define the two dimensional cone

$$C^s_\pi := \Omega_\pi \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}_+ \subset \text{Im } \Omega_\pi.$$

It follows from (5) that

$$\Theta^{-1}_{\pi,\varepsilon} C^s_{\pi'} \subset C^s_\pi.$$

For each $\pi \in \Pi^1$ define the convex cone

$$T^+_\pi = \{(\tau_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \colon \sum_{\pi_0(\alpha)\leq k} \tau_\alpha > 0 \ \mathit{and} \sum_{\pi_1(\alpha)\leq k} \tau_\alpha < 0, \text{ for every } 1 \leq k \leq d-1\}$$

We have [Via08, Lemma 2.13] that

$$(\Theta^t_{\pi,\varepsilon})^{-1} T^+_\pi \subset T^+_{\pi'}$$

Define

$$C^u_\pi = -\Omega_\pi T^+_\pi \subset Im\ \Omega_\pi$$

By definition

$$C^u_\pi \subset \text{ Im } \Omega_\pi \cap \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}_+,$$

and it is easy to show that

$$C^u_\pi \cap \ker\ \Omega_\pi = \{0\}. \tag{8}$$

Note that $\Theta_{\pi,\varepsilon} C^u_\pi \subset C^u_{\pi'}$. Indeed applying T^+_π in (5) we have that

$$\Theta_{\pi,\varepsilon}(-\Omega_\pi T^+_\pi) = -\Omega_{\pi'}(\Theta^t_{\pi,\varepsilon})^{-1} T^+_\pi \subset -\Omega_{\pi'} T^+_{\pi'}.$$

Proposition 2.1 (Uniform hyperbolicity)**.** *For each k there exists $\mu = \mu(k) > 1$ and $C_1, C_2 > 0$ with the following property: Let (π^n, ε^n) be a sequence de combinatorics k-bounded with $r_{\varepsilon^n}(\pi^n) = \pi^{n+1}$. Then*

(a) *For every n and $v \in C^u_{\pi^0}$ we have*

$$\|(\Theta_{\pi^n,\varepsilon^n} \cdots \Theta_{\pi^1,\varepsilon^1}\Theta_{\pi^0,\varepsilon^0})v\| \geq C_1 \mu^n \|v\|.$$

(b) *For every n and $v \in C^s_{\pi^n}$ we have*

$$\|(\Theta_{\pi^{n-1},\varepsilon^{n-1}} \cdots \Theta_{\pi^1,\varepsilon^1}\Theta_{\pi^0,\varepsilon^0})^{-1}v\| \geq C_2 \mu^n \|v\|.$$

Proof. Note that for every n the finite sequence

$$\{(\pi^n, \varepsilon^n), (\pi^{n+1}, \varepsilon^{n+1}), \ldots, (\pi^{n+k}, \varepsilon^{n+k})\}$$

is *complete*, that is, every letter $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ is the winner at least once along this sequence. It follows from [MMY05, Section 1.2.4] and [Yoc10, Section 10.3] that

$$\Theta_{n,n+k(3d-4)} = \Theta_{\pi^{n+k(3d-4)},\varepsilon^{n+k(3d-4)}} \cdots \Theta_{\pi^{n+1},\varepsilon^{n+1}}\Theta_{\pi^n,\varepsilon^n}$$

is a positive matrix with integer entries satisfying

$${}^t(\Theta_{n,n+k(3d-4)})^{-1}\overline{T^+_{\pi^n}} \subset T^+_{\pi^{n+k(3d-4)+1}} \cup \{0\}. \tag{9}$$

By (9) and $\Theta_{\pi^j,\varepsilon^j}\overline{\Omega_{\pi^j}(T^+_{\pi^j})} = \Omega_{\pi^{j+1}}{}^t\Theta^{-1}_{\pi^j,\varepsilon^j}(\overline{T^+_{\pi^j}})$ for all $j \geq 0$ we have

$$\Theta_{n,n+k(3d-4)}\overline{C^u_{\pi^n}} \subset C^u_{\pi^{n+k(3d-4)+1}} \cup \{0\} \tag{10}$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $C^u_{\pi^n} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}_+$, in particular we have

$$\|\Theta_{n,n+k(3d-4)}v\|_1 \geq d\|v\|_1, \tag{11}$$

for every $v \in C^u_{\pi^n}$. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $n = qk(3d-4) + r$, with $q, r \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq r < k(3d-4)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Theta_{0,n}v\| \geq d^q\|\Theta_{0,r}v\|_1 &\geq d^{(n-r)/(k(3d-4)}\min\{\|\Theta^{-1}_{0,r}\|^{-1},\ r < k(3d-4)\}\|v\|_1\\ &= C_1\mu^n\|v\|_1\end{aligned}$$

To show (b), note that by (a) we have that for every n

$${}^t\Theta_{n+k(3d-4),n} = {}^t(\Theta_{\pi^n,\varepsilon^n}\Theta_{\pi^{n+1},\varepsilon^{n+1}} \cdots \Theta_{\pi^{n+k(3d-4)},\varepsilon^{n+k(3d-4)}}).$$

has positive integer entries. Using an argument similar to the proof of (a) we conclude that

$$\|{}^t(\Theta_{\pi^n,\varepsilon^n}\cdots\Theta_{\pi^0,\varepsilon^0})w\| \geq C_1\mu^n\|w\|$$

for every $w \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}_+$. By (5) we have

$$(\Theta_{\pi^{n-1},\varepsilon^{n-1}}\cdots\Theta_{\pi^0,\varepsilon^0})^{-1}\Omega_{\pi^n} = \Omega_{\pi^0}{}^t(\Theta_{\pi^{n-1},\varepsilon^{n-1}}\cdots\Theta_{\pi^0,\varepsilon^0}).$$

Given $v \in C^s_{\pi^0}$ there exists $w \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}_+$ such that $v = \Omega_{\pi^0}w$. The fact that $\Theta^t_{i+k(3d-4),i} > 0$ for every i easily implies that there exist $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in (0,1)$ such that

$${}^t\Theta_{0,n}\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}_+ \subset \Lambda_{\delta_1,\delta_2} = \{(\lambda_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}_+,\ \delta_1 \leq \frac{\lambda_\alpha}{\sum_\beta \lambda_\beta} \leq \delta_2 \text{ for every } \alpha\}.$$

Now note that

$$\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}_+ \cap Ker\ \Omega_{\pi^n} = \emptyset. \tag{12}$$

In fact, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}_+$ be such that $\Omega_{\pi^n}\lambda = 0$. Then by definition of Ω_{π^n} we have

$$\sum_{\pi^n_1(\beta)<\pi^n_1(\alpha)} \lambda_\beta - \sum_{\pi^n_0(\beta)<\pi^n_0(\alpha)} \lambda_\beta = 0, \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Let $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\pi^n_0(\alpha_0) = d$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sum_{\pi^n_1(\beta)<\pi^n_1(\alpha_0)} \lambda_\beta - \sum_{\pi^n_0(\beta)<d} \lambda_\beta \\ &= \sum_{\pi^n_1(\beta)<\pi^n_1(\alpha_0)} \lambda_\beta - \sum_{\pi^n_1(\beta)<\pi^n_1(\alpha_0)} \lambda_\beta - \sum_{\pi^n_1(\beta)>\pi^n_1(\alpha_0)} \lambda_\beta \\ &= -\sum_{\pi^n_1(\beta)>\pi^n_1(\alpha_0)} \lambda_\beta, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

which is a contradiction because $\sharp\{\beta \in \mathcal{A} : \pi_1(\beta) > \pi_1(\alpha_0)\} \geq 1$, due to the fact that $\pi^n = (\pi^n_0, \pi^n_1)$ is irreducible.

By 12 we have that

$$C_3 = \inf\{\frac{\|\Omega_\pi u\|_1}{\|u\|_1},\ u \neq 0, u \in \Lambda_{\delta_1,\delta_2},\ \pi \in \Pi^1 \textit{ and irreducible}\} > 0.$$

For all $v \in C^s_{\pi^n}$ there is $w \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}_+$ such that $v = \Omega_{\pi^n}w$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\|(\Theta_{\pi^{n-1},\varepsilon^{n-1}}\cdots\Theta_{\pi^0,\varepsilon^0})^{-1}v\| &= \|\Omega_{\pi^0}{}^t(\Theta_{\pi^{n-1},\varepsilon^{n-1}}\cdots\Theta_{\pi^0,\varepsilon^0})w\| \\ &\geq C_3\cdot\|{}^t(\Theta_{\pi^{n-1},\varepsilon^{n-1}}\cdots\Theta_{\pi^0,\varepsilon^0})w\| \\ &\geq C_3\cdot C_1\cdot\mu^{n-1}\|w\| \\ &\geq C_3\cdot C_1\cdot\frac{1}{C_4}\cdot\mu^{n-1}\|v\|,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_4=\sup_{\pi\in\Pi^1}\sup_{v\in\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}\setminus\{0\}}\left\{\frac{\|\Omega_\pi v\|}{\|v\|}\right\}.$$

□

Motivated by Proposition 2.1 we define the stable direction in the point $\{\pi^j,\varepsilon^j\}$ as

$$E^s_j := E^s(\pi^j)=\bigcap_{n\geq 0}\Theta_j^{-1}\cdots\Theta_{j+n}^{-1}(C^s_{\pi^{j+n+1}}). \tag{14}$$

By definition the subspaces E^s_j are invariant by the Rauzy-Veech cocycle, i.e, for all $j\geq 0$

$$\Theta_j(E^s_j)=E^s_{j+1}.$$

Now we define the unstable direction. Let $u_0\in C^u_{\pi^0}$ be such that $\|u_0\|=1$. Then we define E^u_0 as the subspace spanned by u_0, that we will be denoted by $<u_0>$. For all $j>0$ we define

$$E^u_j := <\frac{u_j}{\|u_j\|}>,\ \text{where } u_j=\Theta_{j-1}(u_{j-1}). \tag{15}$$

The subspaces E^u_j are forward invariant by the Rauzy-Veech cocycle.

The result of this subsection shows that Rauzy-Veech cocycle is hyperbolic inside Im Ω. In the next subsection we show that outside Im Ω the Rauzy-Veech cocycle has a central direction and it is a quasi-isometry in this direction.

2.2. **Central direction: Periodic combinatorics.**

First we study periodic combinatorics. Suppose that there is $p\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $\{\pi^n,\varepsilon^n\}=\{\pi^{n+p},\varepsilon^{n+p}\}$ for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$, i.e. the combinatorics has period p. So we know that $(\Theta^t_{0,p-1})^{-1}|_{\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^0}}=\mathrm{Id}$, see [Via08, Lemma 2.11].

Lemma 2.2. *Define* $\Psi_p\colon \ker\ \Omega_{\pi^0}\to \mathrm{Im}\ \Omega_{\pi^0}$ *as*

$$\Psi_p(k)=(\Theta_{0,p-1}-\mathrm{Id})^{-1}(k-\Theta_{0,p-1}(k)).$$

Then the subspace $E^c_{0,p-1} := \left\{k+\Psi_p(k),\ k\in\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^0}\right\}$ *is the central direction of* $\Theta_{0,p-1}$*. Indeed* $\Theta_{0,p-1}v=v$ *for every* $v\in E^c_{0,p-1}$.

Proof. Since $\Theta_{0,p-1} - \mathrm{Id}$ is not invertible on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}$, firstly we show that Ψ_p is well defined. We claim that $k - \Theta_{0,p-1}(k) \in \mathrm{Im}\ \Omega_{\pi^0}$. Indeed, using the fact that $(\Theta^t_{0,p-1})^{-1}|_{\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^0}} = \mathrm{Id}$, we have that for all $u \in \ker\ \Omega_{\pi^0}$

$$\begin{aligned} < u, k - \Theta_{0,p-1}(k) > &= < u, k > - < \Theta^t_{0,p-1}(u), k > \\ &= < u, k > - < u, k >= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $k - \Theta_{0,p-1}(k) \perp \ker\ \Omega_{\pi^0}$, which proves our claim. By Proposition 2.1 we have that $\Theta_{0,p-1}$ is hyperbolic in $\mathrm{Im}\ \Omega_{\pi^0}$, so

$$\Theta_{0,p-1} - \mathrm{Id} \colon \mathrm{Im}\ \Omega_{\pi^0} \to \mathrm{Im}\ \Omega_{\pi^0}$$

is invertible on $\mathrm{Im}\ \Omega_{\pi^0}$ and we can define

$$\Psi_p(k) := (\Theta_{0,p-1} - \mathrm{Id})^{-1}(k - \Theta_{0,p-1}(k)).$$

We claim that $\Theta_{0,p-1}v = v$ for every $v \in E^c_{0,p-1}$. Indeed by the definition of Ψ_p

$$(\Theta_{0,p-1} - Id)(k + \Psi_p(k)) = 0.$$

Note that $\dim\ E^c_{0,p-1} = \dim\ \ker \Omega_{\pi^0} = d - 2$. So $E^c_{0,p-1}$ is the central direction. □

The next result shows the invariance of $E^c_{0,p-1}$ by the Rauzy-Veech cocycle.

Lemma 2.3. $\Theta_{\pi^0}(E^c_{0,p-1}) = E^c_{1,p}$.

Proof. Let $v \in E^c_{0,p-1}$. Then

$$\Theta_{\pi^{p-1}} \cdots \Theta_{\pi^0}(v) = v.$$

Applying Θ_{π^0} to both sides

$$\Theta_{\pi^0} \cdot \Theta_{\pi^{p-1}} \cdots \Theta_{\pi^1} \cdot \Theta_{\pi^0}(v) = \Theta_{\pi^0}(v).$$

So

$$\Theta_{1,p} \cdot \Theta_{\pi^0}(v) = \Theta_{\pi^0}(v) \Rightarrow \Theta_{\pi^0}(v) \in E^c_{1,p}.$$

□

We now prove that the Kontsevich-Zorich cocycle behaves as a quasi-isometry in its central direction. By Proposition 2.1 we can choose $n_0 > 0$ and $\mu >> 1$ such that

$$\|\Theta_{n,n+n_0}(x)\| \geq \mu\|x\| \ \forall x \in C^u_{\pi^n} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Theta_{n+n_0,n}(x)\| \geq \mu\|x\| \ \forall x \in C^s_{\pi^n}.$$

For $\epsilon > 0$, define the cones $C^n_{\epsilon,u}$ and $C^n_{\epsilon,s}$, where $C^n_{\epsilon,u}$ is the set of vectors $x = x_k + x_i \in \ker \Omega_{\pi^n} \oplus \mathrm{Im}\Omega_{\pi^n}$ such that

- $\|x_k\| \leq \epsilon\|x_i\|$,

- We have that $x_i = x_i^s + x_i^u$, where $x_i^s \in \Theta_{n+n_0-1,n} C^s_{\pi^{n+n_0}} \subset C^s_{\pi^n}$, $x_i^u \in \Theta_{n-n_0,n-1} C^u_{\pi^{n-n_0}} \subset C^u_{\pi^n}$ and $\|x_i^s\| \leq \|x_i^u\|$.

and we define analogously $C^n_{\epsilon,s}$ replacing the last condition by $\|x_i^u\| \leq \|x_i^s\|$. Define also $C^n_\epsilon := C^n_{\epsilon,u} \cup C^n_{\epsilon,s}$.

Proposition 2.4. *There exists $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(k) > 0$ and $\gamma < 1$ such that if $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$ then*

$$\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(C^n_{\epsilon,u}) \subset C^{n+n_0}_{\gamma\epsilon,u} \quad \textit{and} \quad \Theta_{n-1,n-n_0}(C^n_{\epsilon,s}) \subset C^{n-n_0}_{\gamma\epsilon,s}.$$

Before proving the Proposition 2.4 we need some lemmas.

Lemma 2.5. *There exists $C_5 > 0$ such that for n_0 large enough and all $m > n_0$ there are linear projections Π^s_m and Π^u_m defined in $Im\ \Omega_{\pi^m}$ such that for every $v \in\ Im\ \Omega_{\pi^m}$ we have that $v_s = \Pi^s_m(v) \in \pm\Theta_{m+n_0-1,m}(C^s_{\pi^{m+n_0}})$ and $v_u = \Pi^u_m(v) \in \pm\Theta_{m-n_0,m-1} C^u_{\pi^{m-n_0}}$ satisfy $v = v_s + v_u$ and*

$$\|v_s\|, \|v_u\| \leq C_5 \|v\|. \tag{16}$$

Proof. For a fixed n_0 there exists only a finite number of matrices $\Theta_{m-n_0,m-1}$ and $\Theta_{m+n_0-1,m}$. The same holds for the subspaces $Im\ \Omega_{\pi^m}$ and cones $C^u_{\pi^{m-n_0}}$, $C^s_{\pi^{m+n_0}}$, $\Theta_{m+n_0-1,m}(C^s_{\pi^{m+n_0}})$ and $\Theta_{m-n_0,m-1} C^u_{\pi^{m-n_0}}$. Moreover

$$\pm\, \overline{\Theta_{m+n_0-1,m}(C^s_{\pi^{m+n_0}})} \cap \pm\overline{\Theta_{m-n_0,m-1} C^u_{\pi^{m-n_0}}} = \{0\}. \tag{17}$$

For each possible combination of matrices, cones e subspaces, choose $w_s \in \pm\Theta_{m+n_0-1,m}(C^s_{\pi^{m+n_0}})$ and $w_u \in \pm\Theta_{m-n_0,m-1} C^u_{\pi^{m-n_0}}$. Then $v = c_s w_s + c_u w_u$, with $c_s, c_u \in \mathbb{R}$. Define $\Pi^s_m(v) = c_s w_s$ and $\Pi^u_m(v) = c_u w_u$. Let C_5 be the supremum of the norms of all projections Π^s_m, Π^u_m over all possible combinations of matrices, cones, spaces and choices of w_s and w_u. This supremum is finite due (17). Finally, note that the same C_5 satisfies (16) if we replace n_0 by some $n_1 \geq n_0$, because $\Theta_{m+n_1-1,m}(C^s_{\pi^{m+n_1}}) \subset \Theta_{m+n_0-1,m}(C^s_{\pi^{m+n_0}})$, $\Theta_{m-n_1,m-1} C^u_{\pi^{m-n_1}} \subset \Theta_{m-n_0,m-1} C^u_{\pi^{m-n_0}}$ and the freedom to choose $w_s \in \pm\Theta_{m+n_0-1,m}(C^s_{\pi^{m+n_0}})$ and $w_u \in \pm\Theta_{m-n_0,m-1} C^u_{\pi^{m-n_0}}$ as we like. ☐

Lemma 2.6. *For all $n > n_0$ and for all $x_k \in \ker \Omega_{\pi^n}$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x_k)\|_{\ker \Omega_{\pi^{n+n_0}}} &:= \sup_{k_{n+n_0} \in \ker \Omega_{\pi^{n+n_0}}} < \Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x_k), k_{n+n_0} > \\ &= \|x_k\|_{\ker \Omega_{\pi^n}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $< \cdot, \cdot >$ denote the usual inner product of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}$.

Proof. Note that ${}^t\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(\ker\Omega_{\pi^{n+n_0}}) = \ker\Omega_{\pi^n}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{k_{n+n_0}\in\ker\Omega_{\pi^{n+n_0}}} < \Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x_k), k_{n+n_0} >= \\
&= \sup_{k_{n+n_0}\in\ker\Omega_{\pi^{n+n_0}}} < x_k, {}^t\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(k_{n+n_0}) > \\
&= \sup_{k_n\in\ker\Omega_{\pi^n}} < x_k, k_n > \\
&= \|x_k\|_{\ker\Omega_{\pi^n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 2.4: Let $x = x_i + x_k \in C^n_{\epsilon,u}$. First note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x_i)\| &= \|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x_i^u + x_i^s)\| \\
&\geq \mu\|x_i^u\| - \frac{1}{\mu}\|x_i^s\| \\
&\geq \left(\mu - \frac{1}{\mu}\right)\|x_i^u\|, \qquad (18)
\end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x_k)\|_{\mathrm{Im}\Omega_{\pi^{n+n_0}}} &\leq \|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x_k)\| \\
&\leq \|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}\|\cdot\|x_k\| \\
&\leq \epsilon\cdot\|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}\|\cdot\|x_i\|. \qquad (19)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that by Lemma 2.6 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x_k)\|_{\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^{n+n_0}}} &= \|x_k\|_{\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^n}} \leq \epsilon\|x_i\| \\
&\leq 2\epsilon\|x_i^u\|. \qquad (20)
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x)\|_{\mathrm{Im}\Omega_{\pi^{n+n_0}}} \\
&\quad\geq \|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x_i)\|_{\mathrm{Im}\Omega_{\pi^{n+n_0}}} - \|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x_k)\|_{\mathrm{Im}\Omega_{\pi^{n+n_0}}} \\
&\quad\geq \left(\mu - \frac{1}{\mu}\right)\|x_i^u\| - 2\epsilon\cdot\|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}\|\cdot\|x_i^u\|, \text{ by (18)} \\
&\quad\geq \frac{1}{2\epsilon}\left(\mu - \frac{1}{\mu} - 2\epsilon\cdot\|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}\|\right)\|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x)\|_{\ker\Omega_{\pi^{n+n_0}}} \\
&\quad\geq \frac{1}{2\epsilon}\left(\mu - \frac{1}{\mu} - 2\epsilon\cdot C\right)\|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x)\|_{\ker\Omega_{\pi^{n+n_0}}} \qquad (21)
\end{aligned}$$

Here C depends only on n_0. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x)\|_{\ker\Omega_{\pi^{n+n_0}}}\\ &\leq 2\epsilon\left(\mu-\frac{1}{\mu}-2\epsilon\cdot C\right)^{-1}\|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x)\|_{\mathrm{Im}\Omega_{\pi^{n+n_0}}}.\end{aligned}\tag{22}$$

Choose ϵ_0 small enough such that

$$\gamma := 2\epsilon_0\left(\mu-\frac{1}{\mu}-2\epsilon_0\cdot C\right)^{-1}<1.$$

Note that

$$\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x_i^u)\in\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}C^u_{\pi^n}$$

and

$$v=\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x_i^s)\in C^s_{\pi^{n+n_0}}$$

Let v_s and v_u, $v=v_s+v_u$, be as in Lemma 2.5. Note that

$$\|v_s\|,\|v_u\|\leq C_5\|v\|\leq\frac{C_5}{\mu}\|x_i^s\|\leq\frac{C_5}{\mu}\|x_i^u\|\leq\frac{C_5}{\mu^2}\|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x_i^u)\ \|$$

Then $v_u+\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x_i^u)\in\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}C^u_{\pi^n}$ and $v_s\in\Theta_{n+2n_0-1,n+n_0}(C^s_{\pi^{n+2n_0}})$ and moreover

$$\|v_u+\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x_i^u)\|\geq(1-\frac{C_5}{\mu^2})\|\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x_i^u)\geq\frac{\mu^2}{C_5}(1-\frac{C_5}{\mu^2})\|v_s\|\geq\|v_s\|,$$

so $\Theta_{n,n+n_0-1}(x)\in C^{n+n_0}_{\gamma\epsilon,u}$. The proof of $\Theta_{n-1,n-n_0}(C^n_{\epsilon,s})\subset C^{n-n_0}_{\gamma\epsilon,s}$ is analogous.

□

Proposition 2.7. *Suppose that* $p>n_0$. *Then*

$$\sup_{\substack{k\in\ker\Omega_{\pi^0}\\ k\neq 0}}\frac{\|\Psi_p(k)\|}{\|k\|}\leq\frac{1}{\epsilon_0}.$$

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that this claim is false. Then we could find $\epsilon<\epsilon_0$ such that

$$\sup_{\substack{k\in\ker\Omega_{\pi^0}\\ k\neq 0}}\frac{\|\Psi_p(k)\|}{\|k\|}=\frac{1}{\epsilon}>\frac{1}{\epsilon_0}.\tag{23}$$

Let $k_0\in\ker\Omega_{\pi^0}$ be such that the supremum above is attained on it. Thus $k_0+\Psi_p(k_0)\in C^0_\epsilon:=C^0_{\epsilon,u}\,\dot\cup\,C^0_{\epsilon,s}$. Assume, without loss of generality, that $k_0+\Psi_p(k_0)\in C^0_{\epsilon,u}$. By assumption $E^c_{0,p-1}=E^c_{n_0p,(n_0+1)p-1}$ and by Lemma 2.3 we have $\Theta_{0,n_0p-1}(E^c_{0,p-1})=E^c_{n_0p,(n_0+1)p-1}$. Thus by Proposition 2.4

$$\tilde{k}_0+\Psi_p(\tilde{k}_0)=\Theta_{0,n_0p-1}(k_0+\Psi_p(k_0))\in C^{n_0p}_{\gamma\epsilon,u}\Longleftrightarrow$$

$$\|\tilde{k}_0\| \leq \gamma\epsilon \|\Psi_p(\tilde{k}_0)\| \iff \frac{\|\Psi_p(\tilde{k}_0)\|}{\|\tilde{k}_0\|} \geq \frac{1}{\gamma\epsilon} > \frac{1}{\epsilon},$$

which contradicts (23). $\square$

2.3. **Central direction: arbitrary k-bounded combinatorics.** Let $f \in \mathcal{B}_k^{2+\nu}$ and $\gamma(f) = \{\pi^i, \varepsilon^i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be its combinatorics. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define the new periodic combinatorics, that will be denoted by $\gamma_n(f) = \{\tilde{\pi}^i, \tilde{\varepsilon}^i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$:

(a) For $i \leq n$ define $(\tilde{\pi}^i, \tilde{\varepsilon}^i) = (\pi^i, \varepsilon^i)$, and denote $\tilde{\gamma}_n = \{\tilde{\pi}^i, \tilde{\varepsilon}^i\}_{i=0}^n$;

(b) Let $\tilde{\gamma}_{n,p_n} = \{(\tilde{\pi}^n, \tilde{\varepsilon}^n), ..., (\tilde{\pi}^{p_n}, \tilde{\varepsilon}^{p_n})\}$ be an admissible sequence of combinatorics, i.e., $r_{\tilde{\varepsilon}^i}(\tilde{\pi}^i) = \tilde{\pi}^{i+1}$ for all $n \leq i < p_n$ with $(\tilde{\pi}^{p_n}, \tilde{\varepsilon}^{p_n}) = (\pi^0, \varepsilon^0)$. It is possible to get this sequence by [Via08].

Then define $\gamma_n(f) = (\tilde{\gamma}_n * \tilde{\gamma}_{n,p_n}) * (\tilde{\gamma}_n * \tilde{\gamma}_{n,p_n}) * \cdots$. Note that the combinatorics $\gamma_n(f)$ is periodic of period p_n and that $\gamma_n(f) \to \gamma(f)$ when $n \to \infty$. The Rauzy-Veech cocycle associetade to $\gamma_n(f)$ will be denoted by $\tilde{\Theta}$. By Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 we have that for all $s \geq 0$ the subspace E^c_{s,p_n} is the graph of Ψ_{s,p_n} and $\tilde{\Theta}_s(E^c_{s,p_n}) = E^c_{s+1,p_n}$. By Proposition 2.7 the sequence $\{\Psi_{0,p_n}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is equicontinuous and uniformly bounded, so it admits a subsequence $\{\Psi_{0,p_n}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ that uniformly converges. The same holds for $\{\Psi_{1,p_n}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$, i.e. we can find a infinite subset $\mathbb{N}_1 \subset \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $\{\Psi_{1,p_n}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_1}$ is uniformly converge. Proceeding analogously for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we can find a infinite subset $\mathbb{N}_j \subset \mathbb{N}$, such that $\mathbb{N}_0 \supset \mathbb{N}_1 \supset \cdots \supset \mathbb{N}_j \supset \cdots$ and $\{\Psi_{j,p_n}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_j}$ uniformly converge. Now define the infinite set $\tilde{\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N}$ taking as your j-th element the j-th element of $\mathbb{N}_j$. Define the subspace $E^c_{j,\infty}$ as the graph of

$$\Psi_{j,\infty} = \lim_{\substack{n\to\infty \\ n\in\tilde{\mathbb{N}}}} \Psi_{j,p_n}.$$

By construction we have that $\dim E^c_{j,\infty} = d-2$. The next easy Lemma show that the subspaces $E^c_{j,\infty}$ are invariant by the Rauzy-Veech cocycle.

Lemma 2.8. *For all $j \geq 0$, we have that $\Theta_j(E^c_{j,\infty}) = E^c_{j+1,\infty}$.*

Proof. Denote by $n_j \in \mathbb{N}$ the $j-$th element of $\tilde{\mathbb{N}}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Theta_j(E^c_{j,\infty}) &= \Theta_j(\lim_{\substack{n\to\infty \\ n\in\tilde{\mathbb{N}}}} \mathrm{graph}(\Psi_{j,p_n})) \\
&= \lim_{\substack{n\to\infty \\ n\geq n_j}} \Theta_j(\mathrm{graph}(\Psi_{j,p_n})) \\
&= \lim_{\substack{n\to\infty \\ n\geq n_j}} \mathrm{graph}(\Psi_{j+1,p_n}), \text{ by Lemma 2.3} \\
&= E^c_{j+1,\infty}.
\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Proposition 2.9 (Quasi-isometry in the central direction)**.** *For all vector $v \in E^c_{0,\infty}$ and for all $n \geq 0$, there is $C_6 > 1$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{C_6} \cdot \|v\| \leq \|\Theta_{0,n} v\| \leq C_6 \cdot \|v\|,$$

where $\Theta_{0,n} = \Theta_n \Theta_{n-1} \cdots \Theta_0$.

Proof. For all $v \in E^c_{0,\infty}$, there is $k \in \ker\ \Omega_{\pi^0}$ such that $v = k + \Psi_{0,\infty}(k)$. By continuity of inner product we have that $k \perp \Psi_{0,\infty}(k)$. Then

$$\|k\| \leq \sqrt{\|k\|^2 + \|\Psi_{0,\infty}(k)\|^2} = \|v\| \leq \|k\| + \|\Psi_{0,\infty}(k)\| \leq \|k\| + \frac{1}{\epsilon_0}\|k\|,$$

by Proposition 2.7. Therefore

$$\|v\|_{ker\ \Omega_{\pi^0}} := \|k\| \leq \|v\| \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon_0}\right) \cdot \|k\|. \tag{24}$$

Let $\mathcal{C} := \{u = (u_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}} : u_\alpha = -1, 0, \text{ or } 1\}$. Then

$$\max_{u \in \mathcal{C}} \|u\| \leq \sqrt{d} =: C_7.$$

We know that ${}^t\Theta_{0,n} : \ker\ \Omega_{\pi^n} \to \ker\ \Omega_{\pi^0}$ maps the basis of $\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^n}$ to the basis of $\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^0}$, by [Via08, Lemma 2.16].

For all $\pi \in \Pi^g$ and for all $k \in \ker\ \Omega_\pi$ we can put $k = \sum_{i=1}^d a_i u_i$, where $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and u_i belongs to the basis of $\ker\ \Omega_\pi$, in particular $u_i \in \mathcal{C}$ (see [Via08]). Using the sum norm we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|{}^t\Theta_{0,n} k\| &= \|\sum_{i=1}^d a_i {}^t\Theta_{0,n} u_i\| \\ &= \|\sum_{i=1}^d a_i \tilde{u}_i\|, \text{ where } \tilde{u}_i \in \mathcal{C} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^d |a_i| \cdot \|\tilde{u}_i\| \\ &\leq C_7 \cdot \|k\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\|{}^t\Theta_{0,n}\|_{\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^n}} \leq C_7. \tag{25}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Theta_{0,n}v\|_{\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^n}} &= \sup_{\substack{k\in\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^n}\\ \|k\|\leq 1}} <\Theta_{0,n}v,k> \\
&= \sup_{\substack{k\in\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^n}\\ \|k\|\leq 1}} <v,{}^t\Theta_{0,n}k> \\
&\leq \|v\|\cdot\|{}^t\Theta_{0,n}\|_{\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^n}}\|k\| \\
&\leq C_7\cdot\|v\|,\ \text{due (25)}. \qquad (26)
\end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Theta_{0,n}v\| &\leq \left(1+\frac{1}{\epsilon_0}\right)\|\Theta_{0,n}v\|_{\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^n}},\ \text{due (24)} \\
&\leq \left(1+\frac{1}{\epsilon_0}\right)\cdot C_7\cdot\|v\|,\ \text{due (26)}. \qquad (27)
\end{aligned}$$

Now we can find the lower estimate for $\|\Theta_{0,n}v\|$. First note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Theta_{0,n}v\|_{\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^n}} &= \sup_{\substack{k\in\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^n}\\ \|k\|\leq 1}} <v,{}^t\Theta_{0,n}k> \\
&\geq \sup_{\substack{\tilde{k}\in\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^0}\\ \|\tilde{k}\|\leq \frac{1}{C_7}}} <v,\tilde{k}> \\
&= \frac{1}{C_7}\cdot\sup_{\substack{\tilde{k}\in\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^0}\\ \|\tilde{k}\|\leq 1}} <v,\tilde{k}> \\
&= \frac{1}{C_7}\cdot\|v\|_{\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^0}}. \qquad (28)
\end{aligned}$$

Using (24) we have that

$$\|v\|\leq\left(1+\frac{1}{\varepsilon_0}\right)\cdot\|v\|_{\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^0}}\Rightarrow\left(1+\frac{1}{\varepsilon_0}\right)^{-1}\|v\|\leq\|v\|_{\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^0}}.$$

This estimate jointly with (28) and (27), yields

$$\frac{1}{C_7}\left(1+\frac{1}{\epsilon_0}\right)^{-1}\|v\|\leq\frac{1}{C_7}\|v\|_{\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^0}}\leq\|\Theta_{0,n}v\|_{\ker\ \Omega_{\pi^n}}\leq\|\Theta_{0,n}v\|\leq C_7\left(1+\frac{1}{\epsilon_0}\right)\|v\|.$$

Taking $C_6=C_7\left(1+\frac{1}{\epsilon_0}\right)$ we have the result. $\square$

3. Proof of Theorems 1 and 2

Let $f : [0,1) \to [0,1)$ be a g.i.e.m.. For simplicity we write $R^n(f)(x) = f_n(x) = f^{q_n^\alpha}(x)$ if $x \in I_\alpha^n$. Define $L^n = (L_\alpha^n)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}$ by

$$L_\alpha^n = \frac{1}{|I_\alpha^n|}\int_{I_\alpha^n} \ln Df_n(s)ds = \frac{1}{|I_\alpha^n|}\int_{I_\alpha^n} \ln Df^{q_n^\alpha}(s)ds. \tag{29}$$

Note that if f is a affine i.e.m. then $L_\alpha^n = \omega_\alpha^n$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. The following proposition gives a relationship between L^n and L^{n+1}, more precisely we prove that L^n is an asymptotic pseudo-orbit for the Kontsevich-Zorich cocycle.

Proposition 3.1. *Let* $f \in \mathcal{B}_k^{2+\nu}$ *with* $\int_0^1 D^2(f)(s)/Df(s)ds = 0$. *Then*

$$L^{n+1} = \Theta_n L^n + \vec{\epsilon_n}, \tag{30}$$

where $\|\vec{\epsilon_n}\| = \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}})$, $0 < \lambda < 1$.

Proof. Denote by $x_\alpha^n \in I_\alpha^n$ the point such that $L_\alpha^n = \ln Df^{q_\alpha^n}(x_\alpha^n)$, for all $n \geq 0$.

- If $\alpha \neq \alpha^n(\varepsilon), \alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)$ then clearly $L_\alpha^{n+1} = L_\alpha^n$.

- If $\alpha = \alpha^n(\varepsilon)$ then $q_{\alpha^n(\varepsilon)}^n = q_{\alpha^n(\varepsilon)}^{n+1}$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} L_\alpha^{n+1} &= \ln Df^{q_\alpha^n}(x_\alpha^{n+1}) \\ &= \ln Df^{q_\alpha^n}(x_\alpha^{n+1}) + \ln Df^{q_\alpha^n}(x_\alpha^n) - \ln Df^{q_\alpha^n}(x_\alpha^n) \\ &= L_\alpha^n + \ln Df^{q_\alpha^n}(x_\alpha^{n+1}) - \ln Df^{q_\alpha^n}(x_\alpha^n) \\ &= L_\alpha^n + \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}), \end{aligned}$$

  by Theorem 3 of [CS11].

- If $\alpha = \alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)$ then $q_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}^{n+1} = q_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}^n + q_{\alpha^n n(\varepsilon)}^n$. Note also that $f^{q_{\alpha(1-\varepsilon)}^n}(x_{\alpha^n n(1-\varepsilon)}^n) \in I_{\alpha^n(\varepsilon)}^n$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}^{n+1} &= \ln Df^{q_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}^{n+1}}(x_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}^{n+1}) \\ &= \ln Df^{q_{\alpha^n(\varepsilon)}^n}(f^{q_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}^n}(x_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}^{n+1})) + \ln Df^{q_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}^n}(x_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}^{n+1}) \\ &= \ln Df^{q_{\alpha^n(\varepsilon)}^n}(f^{q_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}^n}(x_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}^{n+1})) - \ln Df^{q_{\alpha^n(\varepsilon)}^n}(x_{\alpha^n(\varepsilon)}^n) + L_{\alpha^n(\varepsilon)}^n \\ &\quad + \ln Df^{q_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}^n}(x_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}^{n+1}) - \ln Df^{q_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}^n}(x_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}^n) + L_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}^n \\ &= L_{\alpha^n(\varepsilon)}^n + L_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}^n + \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}), \end{aligned}$$

  by Theorem 3 of [CS11].

This finishes the proof.

□

Now we decompose the vector $L_n = (L_n)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}$ as

$$L_n = L_n^s + L_n^c + L_n^u \in E_n^s \oplus E_{n,\infty}^c \oplus E_n^u.$$

Lemma 3.2. *The sequence* $\{L_n^s\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *satisfies* $||L_n^s|| = O(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}})$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.1 we have for all $j, n \geq 0$ and for all $v \in E_j^s$ that

$$\|\Theta_{j+n-1}\cdot\Theta_{j+n-2}\cdots\Theta_j v\| \leq \frac{1}{C_2\cdot\mu^n}\|v\|.$$

Replacing this norm by the *adapted norm*, see [Shu87, Proposition 4.2], that still denote by $\|\cdot\|$ for simplicity, we can find $\mu > \tilde{\mu} > 1$ such that for all $n \geq 0$ and for all $v \in E_n^s$ we have

$$\|\Theta_n v\| \leq \frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}}\|v\|.$$

By Proposition 3.1 we have

$$\|L_n^s\| \leq \frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}}\|L_{n-1}^s\| + C\cdot\lambda^{\sqrt{n-1}}.$$

Applying this estimative n times we obtain

$$|L_n^s\| \leq \frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^n}\cdot\|L_0^s\| + C\cdot\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^i}\lambda^{\sqrt{n-i-1}}. \tag{31}$$

Note that

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^n}\cdot\|L_0^s\| \to 0 \text{ when } n\to\infty. \tag{32}$$

Now we analyse the last part of the (31). Denote

$$a_{n,i} = \frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^i}\cdot\lambda^{\sqrt{n-i+1}}.$$

Then

$$\frac{a_{n,i+1}}{a_{n,i}} = \frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}}\cdot\lambda^{\sqrt{n-i-2}-\sqrt{n-i-1}} \leq \frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}}\cdot\lambda^{\frac{-1}{2\sqrt{n-i-2}}}, \tag{33}$$

where the inequality above is given by Mean Value Theorem. Let $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that if $n - i - 2 \geq n_0$ then

$$\lambda^{\frac{-1}{2\sqrt{n-i-2}}} \leq \frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}}.$$

So

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^i}\lambda^{\sqrt{n-i-1}}=\sum_{i=0}^{n-n_0-2}\frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^i}\lambda^{\sqrt{n-i-1}}+\sum_{i=n-n_0-1}^{n-1}\frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^i}\lambda^{\sqrt{n-i-1}}.$$

The first sum is estimated by

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{n-n_0-2}\frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^i}\lambda^{\sqrt{n-i-1}} &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-n_0-2} a_{n,i}\\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-n_0-2}\frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^{2i}}\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}\\ &\leq \lambda^{\sqrt{n}}\cdot\sum_{i=0}^{n-n_0-2}\frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^{2i}},\ \text{por (33)}\\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\tilde{\mu}^{-2}}\cdot\lambda^{\sqrt{n}} \qquad (34)\end{aligned}$$

and the second by

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=n-n_0-1}^{n-1}\frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^i}\lambda^{\sqrt{n-i-1}} &\leq \sum_{i=n-n_0-1}^{n-1}\frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^i}\\ &\leq \frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^n}\sum_{i=n-n_0-1}^{n-1}\frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^{i-n}}\\ &\leq C\cdot\frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^n}. \qquad (35)\end{aligned}$$

Of (32), (34) e (35), we get the result.

□

Lemma 3.3. *There is* $\lambda_5\in[0,1)$ *such that the sequence* $\{L_n^u\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *satisfies* $||L_n^u||=O(\lambda_5^{\sqrt{n}})$

Proof. The proof is similar to Lemma 3.2 and we use the adapted norm again. For all $n\geq 0$ we have that

$$\|L_{n+1}^u\|\geq\tilde{\mu}\cdot\|L_n^u\|-C\cdot\lambda_5^{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Applying this estimative k times, we obtain

$$\|L_{n+k}^u\|\geq\tilde{\mu}^k\|L_n^u\|-C\cdot\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\tilde{\mu}^j\cdot\lambda_5^{\sqrt{n+k-1-j}},$$

and therefore

$$\|L^u_n\| \le \frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^k}\|L^u_{n+k}\| + C\cdot\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\tilde{\mu}^{j-k}\cdot\lambda_5^{\sqrt{n+k-1-j}}.$$

Making $k=n$, we have

$$\|L^u_n\| \le \frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^n}\|L^u_{2n}\| + C\cdot\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\tilde{\mu}^{j-n}\cdot\lambda_5^{\sqrt{2n-1-j}}.$$

The sequence $\{L^u_{2n}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded, then

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}^n}\|L^u_{2n}\| \to 0, \quad \text{when } n\to\infty. \tag{36}$$

Now note that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\tilde{\mu}^{j-n}\cdot\lambda_5^{\sqrt{2n-1-j}} = \sum_{s=0}^{n-1}\tilde{\mu}^{-1-s}\cdot\lambda_5^{\sqrt{n+s}}.$$

Let $a_s=\tilde{\mu}^{-1-s}\cdot\lambda_5^{\sqrt{n+s}}$. Then

$$\frac{a_{s+1}}{a_s} = \frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}}\cdot\lambda_5^{\sqrt{n+s+1}-\sqrt{n+s}} \le \frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}}\cdot\lambda_5^{\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n+s+1}}}. \tag{37}$$

By (37)

$$\begin{aligned}
\textstyle\sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \quad & \tilde{\mu}^{-1-s}\cdot\lambda_5^{\sqrt{n+s}} \\
= \quad & \tilde{\mu}^{-1}\lambda_5^{\sqrt{n}} + \tilde{\mu}^{-2}\lambda_5^{\sqrt{n+1}} + \cdots + \tilde{\mu}^{-n}\lambda_5^{\sqrt{2n-1}} \\
\le \quad & \tilde{\mu}^{-1}\lambda_5^{\sqrt{n}}\left(1+\tilde{\mu}^{-1}\lambda_5^{\sqrt{n+1}-\sqrt{n}} + \cdots + \tilde{\mu}^{-n+1}\lambda_5^{\sqrt{2n-1}-\sqrt{n}}\right) \\
\le \quad & \tilde{\mu}^{-1}\lambda_5^{\sqrt{n}}\left(1+\tilde{\mu}^{-1}\lambda_5^{\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n+1}}} + \ldots + \tilde{\mu}^{-n+1}\lambda_5^{\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n+1}}+\ldots+\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2n-1}}}\right) \\
\le \quad & \tilde{\mu}^{-1}\lambda_5^{\sqrt{n}}\left(1+\tilde{\mu}^{-1}+\ldots+\tilde{\mu}^{-n+1}\right) \\
\le \quad & \tilde{\mu}^{-1}\lambda_5^{\sqrt{n}}\cdot\frac{1}{1-\tilde{\mu}^{-1}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Of (36) and (38) we get the result. ☐

Define for all $n\ge 0$ the vector

$$\tilde{\omega}_n := \Theta_0^{-1}\Theta_1^{-1}\cdots\Theta_{n-1}^{-1}(L^c_n)\in E^c_{0,\infty}.$$

By Proposition 2.9 and Proposition 3.1 it is easy to see that

$$\|\tilde{\omega}_{n+1} - \tilde{\omega}_n\| = \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}).$$

Therefore $\{\tilde{\omega}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges.

Lemma 3.4. *Let* $\omega = \lim_{n\to\infty}\tilde{\omega}_n \in E^c_{0,\infty}$ *and* $\omega^n \in E^c_{n,\infty}$ *be the orbit given by Rauzy-Veech cocycle of* ω*, that is,* $\omega^n = \Theta_0\cdots\Theta_{n-1}\omega$*. Then*

$$\|\omega^n - L_n\| = \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}).$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.2 and 3.3 it is sufficient to estimate $\omega^n - L^c_n$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\omega^n - L^c_n\| &= \|\Theta_0\cdots\Theta_{n-1}\omega - L^c_n\| \\
&\leq \|\,\Theta_0\cdots\Theta_{n-1}|_{E^c_{0.\infty}}\,\| \cdot \|\omega - (\Theta_0\cdots\Theta_{n-1})^{-1}L^c_n\| \\
&\leq C_{30}\cdot\left(1+\frac{1}{\varepsilon_0}\right)\cdot\|\omega - \tilde{\omega}_n\|, \text{ by Proposition 2.9} \\
&= \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

3.1. **Projective Metrics and Proof of Theorem 3.**

The presentation follows Section 4.6 of [Via08]. Consider the convex cone $\mathbb{R}^A_+$. Given any $\lambda, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}^A_+$, define

$$a(\lambda,\gamma) = \inf_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}\frac{\lambda_\alpha}{\gamma_\alpha} \quad \text{and} \quad b(\lambda,\gamma) = \sup_{\beta\in\mathcal{A}}\frac{\lambda_\beta}{\gamma_\beta}.$$

The *projective metric* associated to $\mathbb{R}^A_+$ is defined by

$$\mathrm{d}_p(\lambda,\gamma) = \log\frac{b(\lambda,\gamma)}{a(\lambda,\gamma)} = \log\sup_{\alpha,\beta\in\mathcal{A}}\frac{\lambda_\alpha\gamma_\beta}{\gamma_\alpha\lambda_\beta}.$$

Follows easily from the definition that d_p satisfies, for all $\lambda,\gamma,\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^A_+$

(a) $\mathrm{d}_p(\lambda,\gamma) = \mathrm{d}_p(\gamma,\alpha)$;

(b) $\mathrm{d}_p(\lambda,\gamma) = \mathrm{d}_p(\alpha,\zeta) + \mathrm{d}_p(\zeta,\gamma)$;

(c) $\mathrm{d}_p(\lambda,\gamma) \geq 0$;

(d) $\mathrm{d}_p(\lambda,\gamma) = 0$ if and only if there exists $t > 0$ such that $\lambda = t\gamma$.

Let $G : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}} \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}$ be a linear operator such that $G(\mathbb{R}^A_+) \subset \mathbb{R}^A_+$ or, equivalently, $G_{\alpha\beta} \geq 0$ for all $\alpha,\beta \in \mathcal{A}$, where $G_{\alpha\beta}$ are the entries of the matrix G. Then for all $\alpha,\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}$,

$$\mathrm{d}_p(G(\lambda), G(\gamma)) \leq \mathrm{d}_p(\lambda,\gamma).$$

Now, we define $g : \Delta_{\mathcal{A}} \to \Delta_{\mathcal{A}}$ by

$$g(\lambda) = \frac{G(\lambda)}{\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} G(\lambda)_\alpha} = \frac{G(\lambda)}{\sum_{\alpha,\beta\in\mathcal{A}} G_{\alpha\beta}\lambda_\beta}.$$

We say g is the projectivization of G.

The next proposition, whose proof can be found in [Via08], ensures that if $g(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ has finite d_p-diameter in $\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}$ then g is a uniform contraction relative to the metric projective:

Proposition 3.5. *For any $\Delta > 0$ there is $\kappa < 1$ such that if the diameter of $G(\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}_+)$ relative to d_p is less than Δ then*

$$\mathrm{d}_p(G(\lambda), G(\gamma)) \leq \kappa \cdot \mathrm{d}_p(\lambda, \gamma) \quad \textit{for all} \quad \lambda, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}_+.$$

Let ζ^n be the partition vector of $f_n = R^n(f)$. Define the following linear operator $T_n : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}} \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}$ whose the matrix is given by

$$T_n = (T_n)_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = j \text{ and } i \neq \alpha^n(1-\varepsilon^n n) \\ \exp(\varepsilon^n \cdot L^n_{\alpha^n(1)}), & \text{if } i = j = \alpha^n(1-\varepsilon^n) \\ \exp((1-\varepsilon^n)\cdot L^n_{\alpha^n(1)}), & \text{if } i = \alpha^n(\varepsilon^n), j = \alpha^n(1-\varepsilon^n) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $L_{n,\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon)}$ is defined by (29).

Lemma 3.6. *Let $f \in \mathcal{B}^{2+\nu}_k$ with $\int_0^1 D^2f(s)/Df(s)ds = 0$. Then for all $n \geq 0$*

$$T_n\zeta^{n+1} = \zeta^n + \mathrm{O}(\lambda^n).$$

Proof. It follows easily by the definition of the Rauzy-Veech induction and by Theorem 3 of [CS11]. ☐

Note that $(T_n)_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $n \geq 0$. Then we can define the projectivization of T_n, this is, the map $T^{\mathrm{nor}}_n : \Delta_{\mathcal{A}} \to \Delta_{\mathcal{A}}$ given by

$$T^{\mathrm{nor}}_n\zeta^{n+1} = \frac{T_n\zeta^{n+1}}{|T_n\zeta^{n+1}|_1},$$

where $|\cdot|_1$ denote the sum-norm.

Let ω be either as in Lemma 3.4 (in this case $\omega \in E^c_{0,\infty}$) or a perturbation of it by a vector in E^s_0. Define $\omega^n = \Theta_0 \cdots \Theta_{n-1}\omega$. Define $\tilde{T}_n$ and $\tilde{T}^{\mathrm{nor}}_n$ by

$$\tilde{T}_n = (\tilde{T}_n)_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = j \text{ and } i \neq \alpha^n(1-\varepsilon^n) \\ \exp(\varepsilon^n \cdot \omega^n_{\alpha^n(1)}), & \text{if } i = j = \alpha^n(1-\varepsilon^n) \\ \exp((1-\varepsilon^n)\cdot \omega^n_{\alpha^n(1)}), & \text{if } i = \alpha^n(\varepsilon^n), j = \alpha^n(1-\varepsilon^n) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\tilde{T}_n^{\mathrm{nor}}\zeta = \frac{\tilde{T}_n\zeta}{|\tilde{T}_n\zeta|_1}.$$

Lemma 3.7. *Let $f \in \mathcal{B}_k^{2+\nu}$ with $\int_0^1 D^2f(s)/Df(s)ds = 0$. Then for all $n \geq 0$*

$$\zeta^n = \tilde{T}_n^{\mathrm{nor}}\zeta^{n+1} + \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}),$$

Proof.

$$|\zeta^n - \tilde{T}_n^{\mathrm{nor}}(\zeta^{n+1})| \leq |\zeta^n - T_n^{\mathrm{nor}}\zeta^{n+1}| + |T_n^{\mathrm{nor}}\zeta^{n+1} - \tilde{T}_n^{\mathrm{nor}}\zeta^{n+1}|.$$

Both terms above are of order $\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}$ by Lemma 3.4, Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.6, Lemma 3.7 of [CS11].

□

Given $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n < m$ define

$$\mathcal{T}_n^m := \tilde{T}_n^{\mathrm{nor}} \cdots \tilde{T}_m^{\mathrm{nor}}.$$

By definition of $\tilde{T}_n^{\mathrm{nor}}$ we know that

$$\mathcal{T}_n^m > 0 \Leftrightarrow \Theta_{\pi^n,\varepsilon^n} \cdots \Theta_{\pi^m,\varepsilon^m} > 0.$$

Then by [MMY05, Section 1.2.4] we have that for all $n \geq k(2d-3)$

$$\mathcal{T}_{n-k(2d-3)}^{n-1} > 0. \tag{39}$$

By [CS11] there exists C such that $|\omega_\alpha^n| \leq C$ for every n and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. This implies that there exists c_0 such that for all n

$$\mathcal{T}_{n-k(2d-3)}^{n-1}\Delta_{\mathcal{A}} \subset K_{c_0},$$

where $K_c \subset \Delta_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the set of all $(\zeta_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}$ such that $\zeta_\alpha \geq c > 0$, for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. Note that K_c is relatively compact in $\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}$ and by definition of d_p

$$\mathrm{diam}(K_c) = \sup_{x,y\in K_c} \mathrm{d}_p(x,y) < \infty.$$

and therefore $\mathcal{T}_{n-k(2d-3)}^{n-1}$ is a contraction in the projective metric, and the rate of contraction can be taken uniformly for all n. We will denote this rate by $\kappa < 1$,

Let $c < c_0$ be such that $\zeta_\alpha^n \geq c > 0$ for all $n \geq 0$ and for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. Such c does exist by Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.7 of [CS11]. It is easy to see that the metrics d_p and $|\cdot|_1$ are equivalent in K_c.

Note that for every n and j

$$\mathcal{T}_j^{n+1}\Delta_{\mathcal{A}} \subset \mathcal{T}_j^n\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

Moreover

$$\mathit{diam}\ \mathcal{T}_j^n \leq C\kappa^{(n-j)/k(2d-3)}.$$

In particular

$$\{\tilde{\zeta}^j\} = \bigcap_{n \geq j} \mathcal{T}_j^n \Delta_{\mathcal{A}}$$

for some positive vector $\tilde{\zeta}^j \in K_{c_0}$. As a consequence

$$\tilde{T}_n^{\mathrm{nor}} \tilde{\zeta}^{n+1} = \tilde{\zeta}^n. \tag{40}$$

Lemma 3.8. *Let $f \in \mathcal{B}_k^{2+\nu}$ be such that $\int_0^1 D^2 f(s)/Df(s)ds = 0$. Let f_A be its affine model and let $\zeta^n, \tilde{\zeta}^n$ be as above. Then*

$$|\zeta^n - \tilde{\zeta}^n|_1 = \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n/2}}).$$

Proof. First note that for every n

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d}_p(\zeta^{n-k(2d-3)}, \mathcal{T}_{n-k(2d-3)}^{n-1} \zeta^n) &\leq \mathrm{d}_p(\zeta^{n-k(2d-3)}, \tilde{T}_{n-k(2d-3)}^{\mathrm{nor}} \zeta^{n-k(2d-3)+1}) \\
&\quad + \mathrm{d}_p(\tilde{T}_{n-k(2d-3)}^{\mathrm{nor}} \zeta^{n-k(2d-3)+1}, \mathcal{T}_{n-k(2d-3)}^{n-1} \zeta^n) \\
&\leq \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n-k(2d-3)}}) + \mathrm{d}_p(\zeta^{n-k(2d-3)+1}, \mathcal{T}_{n-k(2d-3)+1}^{n-1} \zeta^n).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying this $k(2d-3)-$times, we obtain

$$\mathrm{d}_p(\zeta^{n-k(2d-3)}, \mathcal{T}_{n-k(2d-3)}^{n-1} \zeta^n) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k(2d-3)-1} \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n-k(2d-3)+i}}), \tag{41}$$

but

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=0}^{k(2d-3)-1} \mathrm{O}(\lambda_5^{\sqrt{n-k(2d-3)+i}}) &= \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n-k(2d-3)}}) \sum_{i=0}^{k(2d-3)-1} \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n-k(2d-3)+i} - \sqrt{n-k(2d-3)}}) \\
&\leq k(2d-3) \cdot \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n-k(2d-3)}}) \\
&= \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n-k(2d-3)}}). \qquad (42)
\end{aligned}$$

The Eq. (41) jointly with Eq. (42) give us

$$\mathrm{d}_p(\zeta^{n-k(2d-3)}, \mathcal{T}_{n-k(2d-3)}^{n-1} \zeta^n) = \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n-k(2d-3)}}). \tag{43}$$

From Eq. (43) it is easy to see that for all $1 \leq j \leq \left[\frac{n}{k(2d-3)}\right]$

$$\begin{aligned}
&d_p(\zeta^{n-jk(2d-3)}, \mathcal{T}^{n-1}_{n-jk(2d-3)}\zeta^n) \\
\leq\ & \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} d_p(\mathcal{T}^{n-ik(2d-3)-1}_{n-jk(2d-3)}\zeta^{n-ik(2d-3)}, \mathcal{T}^{n-(i+1)k(2d-3)-1}_{n-jk(2d-3)}\zeta^{n-(i+1)k(2d-3)}) \\
\leq\ & \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} d_p(\mathcal{T}^{n-(i+1)k(2d-3)-1}_{n-jk(2d-3)}\mathcal{T}^{n-ik(2d-3)-1}_{n-(i+1)k(2d-3)}\zeta^{n-ik(2d-3)}, \mathcal{T}^{n-(i+1)k(2d-3)-1}_{n-jk(2d-3)}\zeta^{n-(i+1)k(2d-3)}) \\
=\ & \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \kappa^{j-1-i}\mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n-(i+1)k(2d-3)}}) \\
\leq\ & \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n-jk(2d-3)}}) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \kappa^{j-1-i} \\
\leq\ & \frac{1}{1-\kappa} \cdot \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n-jk(2d-3)}}).
\end{aligned}$$

so

$$d_p(\zeta^{n-jk(2d-3)}, \mathcal{T}^{n-1}_{n-jk(2d-3)}\zeta^n) = \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n-jk(2d-3)}}). \tag{44}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d}_p(\zeta^{n-jk(2d-3)}, \tilde{\zeta}^{n-jk(2d-3)}) \leq\ & \mathrm{d}_p(\zeta^{n-jk(2d-3)}, \mathcal{T}^{n-1}_{n-jk(2d-3)}\zeta^n) \\
& + \mathrm{d}_p(\mathcal{T}^{n-1}_{n-jk(2d-3)}\zeta^n, \mathcal{T}^{n-1}_{n-jk(2d-3)}\tilde{\zeta}^n) \\
\leq\ & \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n-jk(2d-3)}}) + \kappa^j \cdot \mathrm{d}_p(\zeta^n, \tilde{\zeta}^n) \\
\leq\ & \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n-jk(2d-3)}}) + \kappa^j \cdot \mathrm{diam}(K) \qquad (45)
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $j = \left[\frac{n}{2k(2d-3)}\right]$ in the Eq. (45) we have that

$$\mathrm{d}_p(\zeta^{[n/2]}, \tilde{\zeta}^{[n/2]}) \leq \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{[n/2]}}) + \kappa^{\left[\frac{n}{2k(2d-3)}\right]} \cdot \mathrm{diam}(K),$$

and therefore

$$\mathrm{d}_p(\zeta^n, \tilde{\zeta}^n) = \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}). \tag{46}$$

□

Proposition 3.9. *We have*

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{A}} e^{\omega_i}\tilde{\zeta}^0_i = 1.$$

Proof. For $\zeta \in \Delta_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ define

$$p_n(\zeta) = \frac{\sum_i e^{\omega^n_i}\zeta_i}{\sum_i \zeta_i}$$

Note that

$$p_n(\tilde{T}_n\zeta) = \frac{\sum_i e^{\omega_i^{n+1}}\zeta_i + e^{\omega^n_{\alpha^n(1)}}\zeta_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon^n)}}{\sum_i \zeta_i + e^{\omega^n_{\alpha^n(1)}}\zeta_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon^n)}}.$$

One can easily verify that

$$|p_n(\tilde{T}_n\zeta) - 1| = \frac{\sum_i \zeta_i}{\sum_i \zeta_i + e^{\omega^n_{\alpha^n(1)}}\zeta_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon^n)}}|p_{n+1}(\zeta) - 1| \tag{47}$$

□

By Lemma 3.4 and [CS11, Lemma 3.5] we have that $\sup_{n,\alpha}|\omega^n_\alpha| < \infty$. We have that $\tilde{\zeta}^n \in K_c$ for every n. In particular

$$\sup_n |\frac{\sum_i \tilde{\zeta}_i^{n+1}}{\sum_i \tilde{\zeta}_i^{n+1} + e^{\omega^n_{\alpha^n(1)}}\tilde{\zeta}^{n+1}_{\alpha^n(1-\varepsilon^n)}}| = \theta < 1.$$

By [CS11] we have that $R^n f$ is almost an affine g.i.e.m. so

$$\lim_n \frac{\sum_{i\in\mathcal{A}} e^{L_i^n}\zeta_i^n}{\sum_{i\in\mathcal{A}}\zeta_i^n} = 1.$$

By Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.8 it follows that

$$\lim_n p_n(\tilde{\zeta}^n) = 1.$$

By (47)

$$|\sum_{i\in\mathcal{A}} e^{\omega_i}\tilde{\zeta}_i^0 - 1| = |p_0(\tilde{\zeta}^0) - 1| \leq \theta^n |p_n(\tilde{\zeta}^n) - 1| \to_n 0.$$

Proposition 3.10. *(See also* [MMY10a, Proposition 2.3]*) There is an unique affine g.i.e.m.* f_A *with domain* $[0,1]$*, whose combinatorics is* $\{\pi^i, \varepsilon^i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ *and the slope vector is* ω*.*

Proof. It follows from Proposition 3.9 that the slope vector ω and partition vector $\tilde{\zeta}^0$ defines an affine g.i.e.m. By (40) such affine g.i.e.m. has combinatorics $\{\pi^i, \varepsilon^i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$. To show the uniqueness, note that if $g\colon [0,1] \to [0,1]$ is an affine g.i.e.m. with slope ω and combinatorics $\{\pi^i, \varepsilon^i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ then the partition vectors $\hat{\zeta}^n$ of $R^n g$ satisfies $\tilde{T}_n^{\mathrm{nor}}\hat{\zeta}^{n+1} = \hat{\zeta}^n$. In particular

$$\hat{\zeta}^0 \in \bigcap_{n\geq 0} \mathcal{T}_0^n \Delta_{\mathcal{A}} = \{\tilde{\zeta}^0\}.$$

□

Remark 3.11. *The affine interval exchange map given by Proposition 3.10 is called a weak affine model of f. The weak affine model is not unique. Indeed, for each ω that is a sum of the vector given by Lemma 3.4 and a vector in E_0^s we constructed a corresponding weak affine model.*

From now on we assume without loss of generality that f has only one descontinuity that will be denoted by ∂I_{α^*}.

Lemma 3.12. *Suppose that $f \in \mathcal{B}_k^{2+\nu}$ satisfies $\int_0^1 D^2(f)(s)/Df(s)ds = 0$ and let f_A be a weak affine model of f. Then $BP_f(\partial I_\alpha) = BP_{f_A}(\partial \tilde{I}_\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\alpha \neq \alpha^*$ and $\pi_0(\alpha) > 1$.*

Proof. Denote by n_s the sequence of times of renormalization such that $R^s_{\text{rot}} f = R^{n_s} f$ and note that for all $s > 0$, $\partial I^{n_s}_{\alpha^*}$ is the unique point of descontiuity of f. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\gamma \neq \alpha^*$ and $\pi_0^{n_s}(\gamma) > 1$. As f has no connection we have that there is a unique $1 \leq j_\gamma < q_\gamma^{n_s}$ and unique $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $f^{j_\gamma}(\partial I_\gamma^{n_s}) = \partial I_\alpha$.

We claim that $\alpha \neq \alpha^*$ and $\pi_0(\alpha) > 1$. In fact, if $f^{j_\gamma}(\partial I_\gamma^{n_s}) = \partial I_{\alpha^*}$ then $f^{j_\gamma+1}(\partial I_\gamma^{n_s}) = 0 = f^{q_{\alpha^*}^{n_s}}(\partial I_{\alpha^*}^{n_s})$ which is absurd because f has no connection. If $\pi_0(\alpha) = 1$ then $f^{j_\gamma}(\partial I_\gamma^{n_s}) = \partial I_\alpha = f(\partial I_{\alpha^*})$ which is absurd by the same reason as in the previous case.

By definition of n_s we have that for all $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\pi_0^{n_s}(\beta) + 1 = \pi_0^{n_s}(\gamma)$ then $q_\beta^{n_s} = q_\gamma^{n_s}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} BP_{R^{n_s}f}(\partial I_\gamma^{n_s}) &= \ln D_- R^{n_s} f(\partial I_\gamma^{n_s}) - \ln D_+ R^{n_s} f(\partial I_\gamma^{n_s}) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{q_\beta^{n_s}-1} \ln D_- f(f^i(\partial I_\gamma^{n_s})) - \sum_{i=0}^{q_\gamma^{n_s}-1} \ln D_+ f(f^i(\partial I_\gamma^{n_s})) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{q_\gamma^{n_s}-1} \Big(\ln D_- f(f^i(\partial I_\gamma^{n_s})) - \ln D_+ f(f^i(\partial I_\gamma^{n_s})) \Big) \\ &= \ln D_- f(f^{j_\gamma}(\partial I_\gamma^{n_s})) - \ln D_+ f(f^{j_\gamma}(\partial I_\gamma^{n_s})) \\ &= \ln D_- f(\partial I_\alpha) - \ln D_+ f(\partial I_\alpha) \\ &= BP_f(\partial I_\alpha) \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

As f and its affine model has the same combinatorics we have

$$BP_{R^{n_s} f_A}(\partial \tilde{I}_\gamma^{n_s}) = BP_{f_A}(\partial \tilde{I}_\alpha).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} BP_f(\partial I_\alpha) - BP_{f_A}(\partial \tilde{I}_\alpha) &= BP_{R^{n_s}f}(\partial I^{n_s}_\gamma) - BP_{R^{n_s}f_A}(\partial \tilde{I}^{n_s}_\gamma) \\ &= \ln D_- R^{n_s} f(\partial I^{n_s}_\gamma) - \ln D_+ R^{n_s} f(\partial I^{n_s}_\gamma) \\ &\quad - \ln D_- R^{n_s} f_A(\partial \tilde{I}^{n_s}_\gamma) + \ln D_+ R^{n_s} f_A(\partial \tilde{I}^{n_s}_\gamma) \\ &= L_{n_s,\beta} - L_{n_s,\gamma} + \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n_s}}) - \omega^{n_s}_\beta + \omega^{n_s}_\gamma \\ &= \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n_s}}), \quad \text{by Proposition 3.4.} \end{aligned}$$

□

The Lemma 3.12 gives us that f and f_A have $d-2$ identical breaks.

Proof of Theorem 2. For simplicity we assume $\mathcal{A} = \{1, 2, ..., d\}$ and denote by $j_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ the letter such that ∂I_{j_0} is the descontinuity of f_A. As f and g are break-equivalents, by the Lemma 3.12 we have

$$\omega^f_{i+1} - \omega^f_i = \omega^g_{i+1} - \omega^g_i \ \text{ for every } \ i \in \mathcal{A} \ \text{ such that } \ i \neq j_0 - 1, d,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\omega^f_1 - \omega^g_1 = ... = \omega^f_{j_0-1} - \omega^g_{j_0-1},$$

$$\omega^f_{j_0} - \omega^g_{j_0} = ... = \omega^f_d - \omega^g_d,$$

where we choose $\omega^f = (\omega^f_i)_{i\in\mathcal{A}} \in E^c_{0,\infty}$ and $\omega^g = (\omega^g_i)_{i\in\mathcal{A}} \in E^c_{0,\infty}$ as the slope-vectors of the weak affine models f_A e g_A respectively.

Denoting by $v := \omega^f_1 - \omega^g_1$ and by $\tilde{v} := \omega^f_{j_0} - \omega^g_{j_0}$ we have that

$$\omega^f - \omega^g = (\omega^f_i - \omega^g_i)_{i\in\mathcal{A}} = (v, ..., v, \underbrace{\tilde{v}}_{j_0-\text{position}}, ..., \tilde{v}) \in E^c_{0,\infty},$$

that is, the vector $\omega^f - \omega^g$ can be viewed as the slope-vector of a affine interval exchange maps with two intervals. So we have $(v, \tilde{v}) \in E^c_{0,\infty}(2)$, where $E^c_{0,\infty}(2)$ is the central space defined by the renormalization of two intervals. As $\dim E^c_{0,\infty}(2) = 0$ we have $v = \tilde{v} = 0$ and then $\omega^f = \omega^g$. By Proposition 3.10 we have that $f_A = g_A$. □

The next result estimate the distance between the image partition vectors of $R^n f$ and $R^n f_A$.

Lemma 3.13. *Suppose that* $f \in \mathcal{B}^{2+\nu}_k$ *satisfies* $\int_0^1 D^2(f)(s)/Df(s)ds = 0$ *and let* f_A *be a weak affine model of* f*. Then*

$$\Big| |R^n f(I^n_\alpha)| - |R^n f_A(\tilde{I}^n_\alpha)| \Big| = \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}) \ \textit{ for all } \alpha \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.8. □

Now note that by Theorem 3 of [CS11] we have

$$\|Z_{I^n_\alpha} R^n f - Z_{\tilde{I}^n_\alpha} R^n f_A\|_{C^2} = \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}), \text{ for all } n \geq 0. \tag{49}$$

Theorem 1 follows from (49), Lemma 3.8 and Lemma 3.13.

Proof of Theorem 3. Let f and g as in the assumptions of Theorem 3. Then by Theorem 2 we have that $f_A = g_A$. Therefore

$$d_{C^2}(R^n f, R^n g) \leq d_{C^2}(R^n f, R^n f_A) + d_{C^2}(R^n g_A, R^n g) = \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}).$$

□

4. Smoothness of the conjugacy

To simplify the statements, denote by $\mathcal{B}^{2+\nu}_{k,*}$ the set of all $f \in \mathcal{B}^{2+\nu}_k$ such that $\int_0^1 D^2(f)(s)/Df(s)ds = 0$.

Let $f, g \in \mathcal{B}^{2+\nu}_{k,*}$ be a g.i.e.m. with the the same combinatorics. Then there is a orientation preserving homeomophism $h : [0,1) \to [0,1)$ that conjugates f and g, that is,

$$g \circ h = h \circ f, \tag{50}$$

such that h maps break points of f into break points of g.

4.1. Cohomological equation.

The *cohomological equation* associated to (50) is

$$\ln Dg \circ h - \ln Df = \psi \circ f - \psi, \tag{51}$$

where $\psi : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ is called the solution of (51) if it exists.

For all $x \in [0,1)$ define $i_n(x) := \min\{i \geq 0; f^i(x) \in I^n\}$. Let

$$\psi_n(x) \ := \sum_{i=0}^{i_n(x)-1} \ln Df(f^i(x)) - \ln Dg(h \circ f^i(x)).$$

Lemma 4.1. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{B}^{2+\nu}_{k,*}$ be g.i.e.m. with the same combinatorics and they admit the same weak affine model (they are not necessarily break-equivalents). Then the sequence ψ_n is uniformly convergent. Indeed*

$$|\psi_{n+1}(x) - \psi_n(x)| = \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}). \tag{52}$$

Proof. We will show that ψ_n is Cauchy. Suppose that $i_n(x) < i_{n+1}(x)$. Then $i_{n+1}(x) = i_n(x) + q^n_{(\pi^n_0)^{-1}(d)}$. Therefore

$$\psi_{n+1}(x) - \psi_n(x) = \sum_{i=i_n(x)}^{i_{n+1}(x)-1} \ln Df(f^i(x)) - \ln Dg(h \circ f^i(x))$$

$$= \ln Df^{i_{n+1}(x)-i_n(x)}(f^{i_n(x)}(x)) - \ln Dg^{i_{n+1}(x)-i_n(x)}(h \circ f^{i_n(x)}(x))$$

$$= \ln Df^{q^n_{(\pi^n_0)^{-1}(d)}}(f^{i_n(x)}(x)) - \ln Dg^{q^n_{(\pi^n_0)^{-1}(d)}}(h \circ f^{i_n(x)}(x))$$

$$= \ln DR^n f(f^{i_n(x)}(x)) - \ln DR^n g(h \circ f^{i_n(x)}(x))$$

$$= \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}), \quad \text{by Proposition 3.4.}$$

□

Let $\psi(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \psi_n(x)$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{B}^{2+\nu}_{k,*}$ be g.i.e.m. with the same combinatorics. Assume that they are break-equivalents. Then $\psi : [0,1) \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and it is the solution of* (51).

Proof. It is easy to check that ψ is solution of the (51). Note that $i_n : [0,1) \to \mathbb{N}$ is continuous in the interior of each element of the partition $\mathcal{P}^n$. As a consequence ψ_n is continuous in the interior of each element of the partition. Let $x \in [0,1]$. There are four cases.

Case i. Suppose that $f^n(x) \notin \cup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \partial I_\alpha$ for all n. Then ψ_n is continuous at x for all n and by Lemma 4.1 ψ is continuous at x. Moreover for large n we have that $i_n(f(x)) = i_n(x) - 1$, so it is easy to see that

$$\ln Dg \circ h(x) - \ln Df(x) = \psi_n \circ f(x) - \psi_n(x).$$

Taking the limit on n we obtain (51) for x in *Case i.*

Case ii. Suppose that $x = 0$. Then $\psi_n(0) = 0$, so $\psi(0) = 0$. Let $y > 0$, with $y \in I^n$. Then $i_j(y) = 0$ for every $j \le n$, so $\psi_j(y) = 0$ for every $j \le n$. In particular

$$\psi_{n+p}(y) = \sum_{j=0}^{p} \psi_{n+j+1}(y) - \psi_{n+j}(y),$$

so by (52)

$$|\psi_{n+p}(y)| \le C \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda^{\sqrt{n+j}} \to_n 0.$$

Consequently

$$\lim_n \sup_{y \in I^n} |\psi(y)| = 0,$$

so ψ is continuous at $x = 0$.

Case iii. Suppose that there is $k_0 \geq 0$ such that $f^{k_0+1}(x) = 0$. Note that $f(0)$ falls in Case i., so ψ is continuous in it. Since there are not wandering intervals, the points x in *Case i.* are dense in I. Let x_n be a sequence of points in *Case i.* such that $\lim_n x_n = 0$. Recall that x_n satisfies

$$\ln Dg \circ h(x_n) - \ln Df(x_n) = \psi \circ f(x_n) - \psi(x_n).$$

Using Cases *i.* and *ii.*, we can take the limit on n to obtain

$$\ln Dg(0_+) - \ln Df(0_+) = \psi \circ f(0) - \psi(0) = \psi(f(0)). \tag{53}$$

Let

$$n_0 = \min\{n \geq 0 \ s.t. \ f^i(x) \notin I^n, \ for \ every \ i \leq k_0\}$$

Then $i_n(x_+) = k_0 + 1$ for every $n \geq n_0$. By (52) it follows that

$$\psi(x_+) = \sum_{i=0}^{k_0} \ln Df(f^i(x)) - \ln Dg(h \circ f^i(x)).$$

On the other hand, $i_n(x_-) = i_n(f(0)) + k_0 + 2$ for $n \geq n_0$. So by (53)

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(x_-) &= \sum_{i=0}^{k_0} \ln Df(f^i(x)) - \ln Dg(h \circ f^i(x)) + \ln Df(1_-) - \ln Dg(1_-) \\
&+ \lim_n \sum_{i=k_0+2}^{i_n(x_-)-1} \ln Df(f^i(x_-)) - \ln Dg(h \circ f^i(x_-)) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{k_0} \ln Df(f^i(x)) - \ln Dg(h \circ f^i(x)) + \ln Df(1_-) - \ln Dg(1_-) \\
&+ \lim_n \sum_{i=0}^{i_n(f(0))-1} \ln Df(f^i(f(0))) - \ln Dg(h \circ f^i(f(0))) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{k_0} \ln Df(f^i(x)) - \ln Dg(h \circ f^i(x)) + \ln Df(0_+) - \ln Dg(0_+) \\
&+ \psi(f(0)) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{k_0} \ln Df(f^i(x)) - \ln Dg(h \circ f^i(x)) + \ln Df(0_+) - \ln Dg(0_+) \\
&+ \psi(f(0)) = \psi(x_+).
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that ψ is continuous at x.

Case iv. Now suppose that there is k_0 such that $f^{k_0}(x) = \partial I_\beta$ for some $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$, but $f^k(x) \neq 0$ for every k. In particular f is continuous at $f^k(x)$, for every k. Then $i_n(x_+) = i_n(x_-)$ for every n and

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(x_+) - \psi(x_-) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \psi_n(x_+) - \lim_{n\to\infty} \psi_n(x_-) \\
&= \ln Df(f^{k_0}(x)) - \ln Dg(h \circ f^{k_0}(x)) \\
&\quad - \ln Df(f^{k_0}(x)) + \ln Dg(h \circ f^{k_0}(x)) \\
&= \ln \frac{Df(f^{k_0}(x))}{Df(f^{k_0}(x))} - \ln \frac{Dg(h \circ f^{k_0}(x))}{Dg(h \circ f^{k_0}(x))} \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

4.2. **Conjugacies.** The next step is to show that the conjugacy h is Lipschitz if f and g have the same weak affine model.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{B}^{2+\nu}_{k,*}$ be g.i.e.m. with the same combinatorics and they admit the same weak affine model (they are not necessarily* *break-equivalents). Then there is* $C_8 > 0$ *such that for all* $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{|R^n g(h(I^n_\beta))|}{|R^n f(I^n_\beta)|} = C_8,$$

and this convergence is uniform on β*.*

Proof. Let f_A be a weak affine model of f and g. Let $\hat{h}$ be the corresponding conjugacy, that is, $f_A \circ \hat{h} = \hat{h} \circ f$. By the Mean Value Theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \frac{|R^n f_A(\hat{h}(I^n_\beta))|}{|R^n f(I^n_\beta)|} &= \ln \frac{DR^n f_A(\hat{h}(y))}{DR^n f(y)} + \ln \frac{|\hat{h}(I^n_\beta)|}{|I^n_\beta|} \\ &= \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}) + \ln \frac{|\hat{h}(I^n_\beta)|}{|I^n_\beta|} \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

Now we show that the second term converges. By Lemma 3.8 we have

$$\frac{|I^n_\beta|}{|I^n|} = \frac{|\hat{h}(I^n_\beta)|}{|\hat{h}(I^n)|}(1 + \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}})) \tag{55}$$

and

$$\frac{|R^n f(I^n_\beta)|}{|I^n|} = \frac{|R^n f_A(\hat{h}(I^n_\beta))|}{|h(I^n)|}(1 + \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}).$$

Now suppose that $R^n f$ is type 0. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|I^{n+1}|}{|I^n|} &= \frac{|I^n| - |R^n f(I^n_{\alpha^n(1)})|}{|I^n|} \\ &= 1 - \frac{|R^n f(I^n_{\alpha^n(1)})|}{|I^n|} \\ &= 1 - \frac{|R^n f_A(\hat{h}(I^n_{\alpha^n(1)}))|}{|\hat{h}(I^n)|}(1 + \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}})) \\ &= \frac{|\hat{h}(I^{n+1})|}{|\hat{h}(I^n)|} + \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}}). \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

The case in which $R^n f$ is type 1 is analogous.

From (56) we obtain

$$\frac{|\hat{h}(I^{n+1})|}{|\hat{h}(I^n)|} = \Big(1 + \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}})\Big) \cdot \frac{|I^{n+1}|}{|I^n|}. \tag{57}$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
\ln \frac{|\hat{h}(I^n)|}{|I^n|} &= \ln \frac{|\hat{h}(I^0)|}{|I^0|} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln \left[\frac{|\hat{h}(I^i)|}{|\hat{h}(I^{i-1})|} \cdot \frac{|I^{i-1}|}{|I^i|} \right] \\
&= \ln \frac{|\hat{h}(I^0)|}{|I^0|} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln[1 + \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}})].
\end{aligned}
$$

The sum above is summable, thus

$$
\lim_{n\to\infty} \ln \frac{|\hat{h}(I^n)|}{|I^n|} = \ln C_8. \tag{58}
$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
\ln \frac{|\hat{h}(I^n_\beta)|}{|I^n_\beta|} &= \ln \frac{|\hat{h}(I^n_\beta)|}{|\hat{h}(I^n)|} + \ln \frac{|\hat{h}(I^n)|}{|I^n|} + \ln \frac{|I^n|}{|I^n_\beta|} \\
&= \ln \left(1 + \mathrm{O}(\lambda^{\sqrt{n}})\right) + \ln \frac{|\hat{h}(I^n)|}{|I^n|}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Then there is $C_f > 0$ such that

$$
\lim_{n\to\infty} \ln \frac{|\hat{h}(I^n_\beta)|}{|I^n_\beta|} = \ln C_f. \tag{59}
$$

So by (54)

$$
\lim_{n} \frac{|R^n f_A(\hat{h}(I^n_\beta))|}{|R^n f(I^n_\beta)|} = C_f. \tag{60}
$$

Since f_A is also an weak affine model of g, so there exists a conjugacy $\tilde{h}$ between f_A and g, $\tilde{h} \circ f_A = g \circ \tilde{h}$. As in the proof of (60) we can show that there is $C_g > 0$ such that

$$
\lim_{n} \frac{|R^n g(\tilde{h} \circ \hat{h}(I^n_\beta))|}{|R^n f_A(\hat{h}(I^n_\beta))|} = C_g.
$$

Since $h = \tilde{h} \circ \hat{h}$ it follows that

$$
\lim_{n} \frac{|R^n g(h(I^n_\beta))|}{|R^n f(I^n_\beta)|} = C_f \cdot C_g = C_8.
$$

$\square$

Lemma 4.4. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{B}^{2+\nu}_{k,*}$ be g.i.e.m. with the same combinatorics and they admit the same weak affine model (they are not necessarily break-equivalents). The conjugacy $h : [0,1) \to [0,1)$ is Lipschitz.*

Proof. Let $J_n \in \mathcal{P}^n$. Note that i_n is constant on J_n. By the Mean Value Theorem there exist $y, y' \in J_n$ such that

$$\frac{|h(J_n)|}{|J_n|} \quad = \quad \frac{Df^{i_n}(y')}{Dg^{i_n}(h(y))} \cdot \frac{|g^{i_n}(h(J_n))|}{|f^{i_n}(J_n)|}.$$

As $\{f^j(J_n)\}_{j=0}^{i_n-1}$ is a pairwise disjoint family of intervals it follows that

$$\exp(-V) \leq \frac{Df^{i_n}(y')}{Df^{i_n}(y)} \leq \exp(V),$$

where $V = \operatorname{Var}(\log Df)$. So

$$\frac{Df^{i_n}(y')}{Dg^{i_n}(h(y))} \leq \exp(V) \frac{Df^{i_n}(y)}{Dg^{i_n}(h(y))} \cdot \exp(\psi_n(y)).$$

Since that $f^{i_n}(J_n) = R^n f(I_\alpha^n)$ and $g^{i_n}(h(J_n)) = R^n g(h(I_\alpha^n))$ for some $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ we have

$$C_9 := \sup_n \sup_{J_n \in \mathcal{P}_n} \frac{|g^{i_n}(h(J_n))|}{|f^{i_n}(J_n)|} = \sup_n \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{|R^n g(h(I_\alpha^n))|}{|R^n f(I_\alpha^n)|}$$

is finite by Lemma 4.3.

Note that $C_{10} := \sup_n \sup_{y \in [0,1)} \{\exp(\psi_n(y))\}$ is also finite. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|h(J_n)|}{|J_n|} \quad &\leq \quad C_9 \cdot \exp(V) \frac{Df^{i_n}(y)}{Dg^{i_n}(h(y))} \\ &\leq \quad C_9 \cdot \exp(V) \cdot \exp(\psi_n(y)) \\ &\leq \quad C_9 \cdot C_{10} \cdot \exp(V) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore there is $C_{11} > 0$ such that for n large enough

$$|h(J_n)| \leq C_{11} \cdot |J_n|.$$

Let $x, y \in [0,1)$ be such that $x < y$ and $A = [x, y)$. Define

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = \{J_1 \in \mathcal{P}^1 \ \setminus \ J_1^s \subset A\} = \{J_1^1, \ldots, J_1^{s_1}\}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_n \quad &= \quad \{J_n \in \mathcal{P}^n \ \setminus \ J_n \subset A \text{ and } J_n \cap J = \varnothing \text{ for every } J \in \mathcal{F}_i, \ i < n\} \\ &= \quad \{J_n^1, \ldots, J_n^{s_n}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that if $n \neq m$ then $J_n^s \cap J_m^r = \varnothing$ for all $1 \leq s \leq s_n, \ 1 \leq r \leq s_m$.

It is clear that

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{n}\bigcup_{j=1}^{s_i} J_i^j \nearrow A \quad\text{and}\quad \bigcup_{i=1}^{n}\bigcup_{j=1}^{s_i} h(J_i^j) \nearrow h(A).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
|h(A)| &= \lim_n \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{s_i} |h(J_i^j)| \\
&\le C_{10}\cdot \lim_n \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{s_i} |J_i^j| \\
&\le C_{10}\cdot |A|.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.5. *Let* $f, g \in \mathcal{B}_{k,*}^{2+\nu}$ *be g.i.e.m. with the same combinatorics and they admit the same weak affine model (they are not necessarily break-equivalents). Let* x *in* $[0,1)$*, and let* $J_n \in \mathcal{P}^n$ *be such that* $x \in J_n$*. For every* $y_n, y_n' \in J_n$ *we have*

$$\lim_n \frac{Df^{i_n(x)}(y_n')}{Df^{i_n(x)}(y_n)} = 1.$$

Proof. Note that $f^{i_j}(J_n) \in \mathcal{P}^n$ and $f^{i_j}(J_n) \subset I_\beta^j$, for some $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$. By [CS11], there exists $\theta < 1$ such that

$$\frac{|f^{i_j} y_n - f^{i_j} y_n'|}{|I_\beta^j|} \le \theta^{n-j}.$$

By [CS11] there exists C such that for every $z, z' \in I_\beta^n$ we have

$$\Big|\ln \frac{D(R^j f)(z')}{D(R^j f)(z)}\Big| \le C\frac{|z'-z|}{|I_\beta^n|}.$$

Again by [CS11] we have

$$\Big|\ln \frac{D(R^j f)(z')}{D(R^j f)(z)}\Big| = O(\lambda^{\sqrt{j}}).$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}\ln\frac{Df^{i_n(x)}(y'_n)}{Df^{i_n(x)}(y_n)} &= \sum_{j\leq n/2,\ i_{j-1}<i_j} \ln\frac{D(R^jf)(f^{i_j}(y'_n))}{D(R^jf)(f^{i_j}(y_n))}\\ &+ \sum_{n/2<j\leq n,\ i_{j-1}<i_j} \ln\frac{D(R^jf)(f^{i_j}(y'_n))}{D(R^jf)(f^{i_j}(y_n))}\\ &= O(\sum_{j\leq n/2}\theta^{n-j}) + O(\sum_{n/2<j\leq n}\lambda^{\sqrt{j}})\\ &\to_n 0\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 4.6. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{B}^{2+\nu}_{k,*}$ be g.i.e.m. with the same combinatorics. Assume that they are break-equivalents. Then the conjugacy $h : [0,1) \to [0,1)$ is C^1.*

Proof. Note that $Dh(x)$ exists for almost every $x \in [0,1)$ and by Lemma 4.4 the map h is the integral of its derivative. Let $x_0 \in [0,1)$ be such that $Dh(x_0)$ exists. For all $n \geq 0$ there is $J_n \in \mathcal{P}^n$ such that $x_0 \in J_n$. Then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{|h(J_n)|}{|J_n|} = Dh(x_0). \tag{61}$$

Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ be such that

$$f^{i_n(x_0)}(J_n) = R^nf(I^n_\alpha).$$

We also have that $g^{i_n(x_0)}(h(J_n)) = R^ng(h(I^n_\alpha))$. Let $y' \in J_n$ be such that

$$|J_n| = \frac{|R^nf(I^n_\alpha)|}{Df^{i_n(x_0)}(y')}.$$

Analogously let $y \in J_n$ be such that

$$|h(J_n)| = \frac{|R^ng(h(I^n_\alpha))|}{Dg^{i_n(x_0)}(h(y))}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{|h(J_n)|}{|J_n|} &= \frac{Df^{i_n(x_0)}(y')}{Dg^{i_n(x_0)}(h(y))}\cdot\frac{|R^ng(h(I^n_\alpha))|}{|R^nf(I^n_\alpha)|}\\ &= \frac{Df^{i_n(x_0)}(y')}{Df^{i_n(x_0)}(y)}\cdot e^{\psi_n(y)}\cdot\frac{|R^ng(h(I^n_\alpha))|}{|R^nf(I^n_\alpha)|}.\end{aligned}$$

When n converges to infinity we have, by Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.5 that

$$Dh(x_0) = C_8 \cdot e^{\psi(x_0)}. \tag{62}$$

Writing

$$h(x) = \int_0^x Dh(s)\, ds = \int_0^x C_8 \cdot e^{\psi(s)}\, ds,$$

we have the result. □

Proposition 4.7. *If $f, g \in \mathcal{B}^{2+\nu}_{k,*}$ have the same combinatorics and they admit the same weak affine model then h is differentiable at every point x_0 such that $f^n(x_0) \neq 0$ for all $n \geq 0$ and (62) holds.*

Proof. One can prove that ψ is continuous at every point x_0 such that $f^n(x_0) \neq 0$ for all $n \geq 0$. Indeed under this assumption we can carry out Cases *i* and *iv* in the proof of Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 3.12, as well the proof of Proposition 4.6. □

5. Linearization

In this section we will show that, for each $f \in \mathcal{B}^{2+\nu}_{k,*}$ there exists a *unique* weak affine model that is C^1 conjugate with f.

Lemma 5.1. *Let f_A and f_B be two weak affine models of f. If f_A and f_B have the same breaks then $f_A = f_B$. In particular if f_A and f_B are C^1 conjugate on the circle then $f_A = f_B$.*

Proof. If f_A and f_B have the same breaks, the corresponding slope vectors ω^A and ω^B satisfy $\omega^A_i - \omega^B_i = v$, for every i. Let H be a conjugacy of f_A with a rotation on the circle. By [MMY10a, Proposition 2.3] we have

$$\sum_i \omega^A_i |H(I^A_i)| = \sum_i \omega^B_i |H(I^A_i)| = 0,$$

which implies $\omega^A = \omega^B$. By Proposition 3.10 we have that $f_A = f_B$. □

Proof of Theorem 5. Let ω be as in Lemma 3.4 and choose $v \in E^s_0 \setminus \{0\}$. By Proposition 3.10 there is an unique weak affine model g_t of f with vector slope $\omega_t := \omega + t \cdot v$. By Lemma 5.1 the break at 0 is a *non constant* linear functional on t. Let t_0 be the unique parameter such that the break at 0 of g_{t_0} coincides with the break at 0 of f. Since by Lemma 3.12 they already have $d-2$ identical breaks and the product of the breaks is 1, it follows that all the breaks of f and g_{t_0} coincides. By Theorem 4 the conjugacy between f and g_{t_0} is C^1. On the other hand, every piecewise affine homeomorphism g of the circle that is C^1 conjugate with f is a weak affine model of f with the same break points of f, so $g = g_{t_0}$. □

Remark 5.2. *All weak affine models of the g.i.e.m.* f *belongs the the one-parameter family* g_t*. All of them are Lipchitz conjugate with* f*. Only one of these weak models, the strong affine model* g_{t_0}*, is indeed* C^1 *conjugate with* f*.*

References

[AV07] Artur Avila and Marcelo Viana, *Simplicity of Lyapunov spectra: proof of the Zorich-Kontsevich conjecture*, Acta Math. **198** (2007), no. 1, 1–56. MR 2316268 (2008m:37010)

[Cun10] K. Cunha, *Transformações de intercâmbio de intervalos generalizadas de genus 1*, Ph.D. Thesis, ICMC-USP, Brazil , 2010.

[CS11] K. Cunha and D. Smania, *Renormalization for piecewise smooth homeomorphisms on the circle*, ArXiv e-prints (2011), `http://arxiv.org/abs/1108.1968`.

[For02] Giovanni Forni, *Deviation of ergodic averages for area-preserving flows on surfaces of higher genus*, Ann. of Math. (2) **155** (2002), no. 1, 1–103. MR 1888794 (2003g:37009)

[Her79] Michael-Robert Herman, *Sur la conjugaison différentiable des difféomorphismes du cercle à des rotations*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1979), no. 49, 5–233. MR MR538680 (81h:58039)

[Kea75] Michael Keane, *Interval exchange transformations*, Math. Z. **141** (1975), 25–31. MR MR0357739 (50 #10207)

[KO89] Y. Katznelson and D. Ornstein, *The differentiability of the conjugation of certain diffeomorphisms of the circle*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **9** (1989), no. 4, 643–680. MR 1036902 (91i:58121)

[KK03] K. Khanin and D. Khmelev, *Renormalizations and rigidity theory for circle homeomorphisms with singularities of the break type*, Comm. Math. Phys., 235 (2003), no. 1, 69–124. MR 1969721 (2003m:37051)

[KT10] O. Yu. Teplīnskiĭ and K Khanīn, *Smooth conjugacy of circle diffeomorphisms with a break*, Nelīnīĭnī Koliv., 13 (2010),no. 1,100–114. MR 2742089 (2011h:37059)

[MMY05] S. Marmi, P. Moussa, and J.-C. Yoccoz, *The cohomological equation for Roth-type interval exchange maps*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **18** (2005), no. 4, 823–872 (electronic). MR MR2163864 (2006f:37006)

[MMY10a] ———, *Affine interval exchange maps with a wandering interval*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **100** (2010), no. 3, 639–669. MR 2640286 (2012a:37042)

[MMY10b] S. Marmi, P. Moussa, and J.-C. Yoccoz, *Linearization of generalized interval exchange maps*, ArXiv e-prints (2010).

[Rau79] Gérard Rauzy, *Échanges d'intervalles et transformations induites*, Acta Arith. **34** (1979), no. 4, 315–328. MR MR543205 (82m:10076)

[Shu87] Michael Shub, *Global stability of dynamical systems*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987, With the collaboration of Albert Fathi and Rémi Langevin, Translated from the French by Joseph Christy. MR 869255 (87m:58086)

[SK89] Ya. G. Sinaĭ and K. M. Khanin, *Smoothness of conjugacies of diffeomorphisms of the circle with rotations*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **44** (1989), no. 1(265), 57–82, 247. MR MR997684 (90i:58183)

[Vee78] William A. Veech, *Interval exchange transformations*, J. Analyse Math. **33** (1978), 222–272. MR MR516048 (80e:28034)

[Via08] Marcelo Viana, *Dynamics of interval exchange transformations and teichmuller flows*, Lecture notes. 2007. `http://www.impa.br/~viana`

[Yoc10] Jean-Christophe Yoccoz, *Interval exchange maps and translation surfaces*, Homogeneous flows, moduli spaces and arithmetic, Clay Math. Proc., vol. 10, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010, pp. 1–69. MR 2648692

[Zor96] Anton Zorich, *Finite Gauss measure on the space of interval exchange transformations. Lyapunov exponents*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **46** (1996), no. 2, 325–370. MR MR1393518 (97f:58081)

Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Av. Ademar de Barros s/n, CEP 40170-110 Salvador-BA, Brazil
E-mail address: `kleyber@ufba.br`

Departamento de Matemática, ICMC-USP, Caixa Postal 668, São Carlos-SP, CEP 13560-970 São Carlos-SP, Brazil
E-mail address: `smania@icmc.usp.br`
URL: `www.icmc.usp.br/∼smania/`